arXiv:0811.1152v1 [math.AP] 7 Nov 2008

Long-time existence for semi-linear Klein-Gordon equations with quadratic potential

Q.-D. Zhang *†
Department of Mathematics, Zhejiang University,
Hangzhou, 310027, China
&
Université Paris 13, Institut Galilée,
CNRS, UMR 7539, Laboratoire Analyse Géométrie et Applications
99, Avenue J.-B. Clément,
F-93430 Villetaneuse

Abstract

We prove that small smooth solutions of semi-linear Klein-Gordon equations with quadratic potential exist over a longer interval than the one given by local existence theory, for almost every value of mass. We use normal form for the Sobolev energy. The difficulty in comparison with some similar results on the sphere comes from the fact that two successive eigenvalues λ, λ' of $\sqrt{-\Delta + |x|^2}$ may be separated by a distance as small as $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}$.

0 Introduction

Let $-\Delta + |x|^2$ be the harmonic oscillator on $\mathbb{R}^d$. This paper is devoted to the proof of lower bounds for the existence time of solutions of non-linear Klein-Gordon equations of type

$$\begin{aligned}(\partial_t^2 - \Delta + |x|^2 + m^2)v &= v^{\kappa+1}\\ v|_{t=0} &= \epsilon v_0\\ \partial_t v|_{t=0} &= \epsilon v_1\end{aligned}$$

where $m \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, $x^\alpha \partial_x^\beta v_j \in L^2$ when $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq s + 1 - j$ $(j = 0, 1)$ for a large enough integer s, and where $\epsilon > 0$ is small enough.

The similar equation without the quadratic potential $|x|^2$, and with data small, smooth and compactly supported, has global solutions when $d \geq 2$ (see Klainerman [18] and Shatah [23] for dimensions $d \geq 3$, Ozawa, Tsutaya and Tsutsumi [22] when $d = 2$). The situation is drastically different when we replace $-\Delta$ by $-\Delta + |x|^2$, since the latter operator has pure point spectrum. This prevents any time decay for solutions of the linear equation. Because of that, the question of long time existence for Klein-Gordon equations associated to the harmonic oscillator is similar to the corresponding problem on compact manifolds.

For the equation $(\partial_t^2 - \Delta + m^2)v = v^{\kappa+1}$ on the circle $\mathbb{S}^1$, it has been proved by Bourgain [6] and Bambusi [1], that for almost every $m > 0$, the above equation has solutions defined on intervals

---

[*] The author is supported by NSFC 10871175.

[†] email address: zjuzqd@163.com

of length $c_N\epsilon^{-N}$ for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, if the data are smooth and small enough (see also the lectures of Grébert [13]). These results have been extended to the sphere $\mathbb{S}^d$ instead of $\mathbb{S}^1$ by Bambusi, Delort, Grébert and Szeftel [2]. A key property in the proofs is the structure of the spectrum of $\sqrt{-\Delta}$ on $\mathbb{S}^d$. It is made of the integers, up to a small perturbation, so that the gap between two successive eigenvalues is bounded from below by a fixed constant.

A natural question is to examine which lower bounds on the time of existence of solutions might be obtained when the eigenvalues of the operator do not satisfy such a gap condition. The problem has been addressed for $(\partial_t^2 - \Delta + m^2)v = v^{\kappa+1}$ on the torus $\mathbb{T}^d$ when $d \geq 2$ by Delort [9]. It has been proved that for almost every $m > 0$, the solution of such an equation exists over an interval of time of length bounded from below by $c\epsilon^{-\kappa(1+2/d)}$ (up to a logarithm) and has Sobolev norms of high index bounded on such an interval. Note that two successive eigenvalues λ, λ' of $\sqrt{-\Delta}$ on $\mathbb{T}^d$ might be separated by an interval of length as small as c/λ. A natural question is then to study the same problem for a model for which separation of eigenvalues is intermediate between the cases of the sphere and of the torus. The harmonic oscillator provides such a framework, as the distance between two successive eigenvalues λ, λ' of $\sqrt{-\Delta + |x|^2}$ is of order $1/\sqrt{\lambda}$. Our goal is to exploit this to get for the corresponding Klein-Gordon equation a lower bound of the time of existence of order $c\epsilon^{-4\kappa/3}$ when $d \geq 2$ (and a slightly better bound if $d = 1$).

Note that the estimate we get for the time of existence is explicit (given by the exponent $-4\kappa/3$) and independent of the dimension d. This is in contrast with the case of the torus, where the gain $2/d$ on the exponent brought by the method goes to zero as $d \to +\infty$. The point is that when the dimension increases, the multiplicity of the eigenvalues of $-\Delta + |x|^2$ grows, while the spacing between different eigenvalues remains essentially the same.

The method we use is based, as for similar problems on the sphere and the torus, on normal form methods. Such an idea has been introduced in the study of non-linear Klein-Gordon equations on $\mathbb{R}^d$ by Shatah [23], and is at the root of the results obtained on $\mathbb{S}^1, \mathbb{S}^d, \mathbb{T}^d$ in [6, 1, 3, 2, 9]. In particular, we do not need to use any KAM results, unlike in the study of periodic or quasi-periodic solutions of semi-linear wave or Klein-Gordon equations. For such a line of studies, we refer to the books of Kuksin [20, 21] and Craig [8] in the case of the equation on $\mathbb{S}^1$, to Berti and Bolle [4] for recent results on the sphere, and to Bourgain [7] and Elliasson-Kuksin [12] in the case of the torus.

Finally let us mention that very recently Grébert, Imekraz and Paturel [14] have studied the non-linear Schrödinger equation associated to the harmonic oscillator. They have obtained almost global existence of small solutions for this equation.

1 The semi-linear Klein-Gordon equation

1.1 Sobolev Spaces

We introduce in this subsection Sobolev spaces we will work with. From now on, we denote by $P = \sqrt{-\Delta + |x|^2}, x \in \mathbb{R}^d, d \geq 1$. The operator $P^2 = -\Delta + |x|^2$ is called the harmonic oscillator on $\mathbb{R}^d$. The eigenvalues of P^2 are given by λ_n^2, where

$$\lambda_n = \sqrt{2n + d}, n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{1.1.1}$$

Let Π_n be the orthogonal projector to the eigenspace associated to λ_n^2. There are several ways to characterize these spaces. Of course we will show they are equivalent after giving definitions.

Definition 1.1.1. *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$. We define $\mathscr{H}_1^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to be the set of all functions $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that*
$(\lambda_n^s ||\Pi_n u||_{L^2})_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \ell^2$, *equipped with the norm defined by* $||u||^2_{\mathscr{H}_1^s} = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \lambda_n^{2s} ||\Pi_n u||^2_{L^2}$.

The space $\mathscr{H}_1^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the domain of the operator $g(P)$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which is defined using functional calculus and where

$$g(r) = (1+r^2)^{\frac{s}{2}}, r \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{1.1.2}$$

Because of (1.1.1), we have

$$||g(P)u||_{L^2} \sim ||u||_{\mathscr{H}_1^s}. \tag{1.1.3}$$

Definition 1.1.2. *Let $s \in \mathbb{N}$. We define $\mathscr{H}_2^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to be the set of all functions $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $x^\alpha \partial^\beta u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \forall |\alpha| + |\beta| \leq s$, equipped with the norm defined by $||u||^2_{\mathscr{H}_2^s} = \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|\leq s} ||x^\alpha \partial^\beta u||^2_{L^2}$.*

We shall give another definition of the space in the view point of pseudo-differential theory. Let us first list some results from [16].

Definition 1.1.3. *We denote by $\Gamma^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where $s \in \mathbb{R}$, the set of all functions $u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that: $\forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d$, $\exists\ C_\alpha$, s.t. $\forall z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have $|\partial_z^\alpha a(z)| \leq C_\alpha \langle z\rangle^{s-|\alpha|}$, where $\langle z \rangle = (1+|z|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.*

Definition 1.1.4. *Assume $a_j \in \Gamma^{s_j}(\mathbb{R}^d) (j \in \mathbb{N}^*)$ and that s_j is a decreasing sequence tending to $-\infty$. We say a function $a \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfies:*

$$a \sim \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j$$

if: $\qquad \forall r \geq 2, r \in \mathbb{N}, \qquad a - \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} a_j \in \Gamma^{s_r}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

We now would like to consider operators of the form

$$Au(x) = (2\pi)^{-d} \iint e^{i(x-y)\cdot\xi} a(x,\xi)u(y)dyd\xi \tag{1.1.4}$$

where $a(x,\xi) \in \Gamma^s(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$. We can also consider a more general formula for the action of the operator

$$Au(x) = (2\pi)^{-d} \iint e^{i(x-y)\cdot\xi} a(x,y,\xi)u(y)dyd\xi \tag{1.1.5}$$

where the function $a(x,y,\xi)$ is called the amplitude. We will describe the class of amplitudes as following:

Definition 1.1.5. *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\Omega^s(\mathbb{R}^{3d})$ denote the set of functions $a(x,y,\xi) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{3d})$, which for some $s' \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy*

$$|\partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_x^\beta \partial_y^\gamma a(x,y,\xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \langle z\rangle^{s-(|\alpha|+|\beta|+|\gamma|)} \langle x-y\rangle^{s'+|\alpha|+|\beta|+|\gamma|},$$

where $z = (x,y,\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{3d}$.

The following proposition is a special case of proposition 1.1.4 in [16].

Proposition 1.1.6. *If $b \in \Gamma^s(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, then $a(x,y,\xi) = b(x,\xi)$ and $a(x,y,\xi) = b(y,\xi)$ belong to $\Omega^s(\mathbb{R}^{3d})$.*

Let $\chi(x, y, \xi) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{3d}), \chi(0, 0, 0) = 1$. It is shown by lemma 1.2.1 in [16] that (1.1.5) makes sense in the following way:

$$Au(x) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to +0} (2\pi)^{-d} \iint e^{i(x-y)\cdot\xi} \chi(\varepsilon x, \varepsilon y, \varepsilon \xi) a(x, y, \xi) u(y) dy d\xi \tag{1.1.6}$$

if $a(x, y, \xi) \in \Omega^s(\mathbb{R}^{3d})$ for some s. It is also shown in the same section of it the operator A is continuous from $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and it can be uniquely extended to an operator from $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Definition 1.1.7. *The class of pseudo-differential operators A of the form (1.1.5) with amplitudes $a \in \Omega^s(\mathbb{R}^{3d})$ will be denoted by $G^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

We set $G^{-\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \bigcap_{s \in \mathbb{R}} G^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Example 1.1.8. *For $s \in \mathbb{N}$, the constant coefficient differential operator $\sum\limits_{|\alpha|+|\beta| \le s} c_{\alpha\beta} x^\alpha \partial^\beta$ is in the class $G^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

The class $G^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ has some properties which are just theorems 1.3.1, 1.4.7, 1.4.8 in [16]:

Theorem 1.1.9. *Let $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $A \in G^{s_1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $A' \in G^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then $A \circ A' \in G^{s_1+s_2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

Theorem 1.1.10. *The operator $A \in G^0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ can be extended to a bounded operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

Theorem 1.1.11. *The operator $A \in G^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for $s < 0$ can be extended to a compact operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

We shall give a subclass of that of pseudo-differential operators.

Definition 1.1.12. *We say $a \in \Gamma^s_{cl}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if $a \in \Gamma^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and a has asymptotic expansion:*

$$a \sim \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} a_{s-j}$$

with $a_{s-j} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying for $\theta \ge 1, |x| + |\xi| \ge 1$

$$a_{s-j}(\theta x, \theta \xi) = \theta^{s-j} a_{s-j}(x, \xi).$$

Definition 1.1.13. *Let A be a pseudo-differential operator with amplitude $a \in \Gamma^s_{cl}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We then call a_s defined above the principle symbol of A.*

Definition 1.1.14. *We say a pseudo-differential operator $A \in G^s_{cl}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if its amplitude $a \in \Gamma^s_{cl}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$.*

By proposition 1.1.6, definition 1.1.14 is meaningful.

Definition 1.1.15. *We say that $A \in G^s_{cl}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is globally elliptic if we have: $\exists R > 0, \exists\ C > 0$ such that $\forall (x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ satisfying $|x| + |\xi| \ge R$, we have $|a_s(x, \xi)| \ge C(|x| + |\xi|)^s$, where a_s denotes the principle symbol of A.*

We can invert the operator $A \in G^s_{cl}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ up to a regularizing operator, which is just theorem 1.5.7 in [16].

Theorem 1.1.16. *Let $A \in G^s_{cl}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a globally elliptic operator. Then there is an operator $B \in G^{-s}_{cl}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that*

$$B \circ A = I + R_1, \qquad A \circ B = I + R_2, \tag{1.1.7}$$

where R_1, R_2 are regularizing, i.e. $R_1, R_2 \in G^{-\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Definition 1.1.17. *Let A be a pseudo-differential operator whose symbol is $\langle \xi, x\rangle^s$ modulo Γ^{s-1}_{cl}. We define $\mathscr{H}^s_3(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to be the set of all functions $u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $Au \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, equipped with the norm defined by $||u||^2_{\mathscr{H}^s_3} = ||Au||^2_{L^2} + ||u||^2_{L^2}$.*

Remark 1.1.1. *The pseudo-differential operator A defined above is globally elliptic. Thus by theorem 1.1.16 if $Au \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we must have $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

Remark 1.1.2. *$\mathscr{H}^s_3(\mathbb{R}^d)$ does not depend on the choice of A according to corollary 1.6.5 in [16].*

Corollary 1.1.18. *When $s \in \mathbb{N}$, definitions 1.1.1, 1.1.2 and 1.1.17 characterize the same space. Moreover $\mathscr{H}^s_3(\mathbb{R}^d) = \mathscr{H}^s_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. First let $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Since A in definition 1.1.17 is globally elliptic, by theorem 1.1.16 there is $B \in G^{-s}_{cl}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$B \circ A = I + R_1, \qquad A \circ B = I + R_2 \tag{1.1.8}$$

where R_1, R_2 are regularizing. Thus for any α, β with $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq s$, by the example after definition 1.1.12 and theorems 1.1.9, 1.1.10 and 1.1.11, we have $||x^\alpha \partial^\beta u||_{L^2} \leq ||x^\alpha \partial^\beta BAu||_{L^2} + ||x^\alpha \partial^\beta R_1 u||_{L^2} \leq C(||Au||_{L^2} + ||u||_{L^2})$, which implies $||u||_{\mathscr{H}^s_2} \leq C||u||_{\mathscr{H}^s_3}$. The inverse inequality follows from the proof of proposition 1.6.6 in [16]. Let us now prove that definition 1.1.1 is equivalent to definition 1.1.17 for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

By Theorem 1.11.2 in [16] the operator $g(P)$ defined in (1.1.2) is an essentially self-adjoint globally elliptic operator in the class $G^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We have again by theorem 1.1.16 that there is $Q \in G^{-s}_{cl}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$g(P) \circ Q = I + R'_1, \qquad Q \circ g(P) = I + R'_2 \tag{1.1.9}$$

where R'_1, R'_2 are regularizing. We compute using (1.1.3), (1.1.8), (1.1.9) together with theorem 1.1.9 and theorem 1.1.10

$$\begin{aligned} ||u||_{\mathscr{H}^s_1} \sim ||g(P)u||_{L^2} &\leq ||(g(P) \circ B \circ A)u||_{L^2} + ||(g(P) \circ R_1)u||_{L^2} \\ &\leq C(||Au||_{L^2} + ||u||_{L^2}) \leq C||u||_{\mathscr{H}^s_3} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} ||u||_{\mathscr{H}^s_3} &\leq C(||(A \circ Q \circ g(P))u||_{L^2} + ||(A \circ R'_2)u||_{L^2} + ||u||_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C(||g(P)u||_{L^2} + ||u||_{L^2}) \leq C||u||_{\mathscr{H}^s_1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact $\lambda_n \geq 1$. □

We denote $\mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d) = \mathscr{H}^s_1(\mathbb{R}^d) = \mathscr{H}^s_3(\mathbb{R}^d)$ when $s \in \mathbb{R}$. When $s \in \mathbb{N}$, this space coincides with $\mathscr{H}^s_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Let us present some properties of the spaces we shall use.

Proposition 1.1.19. *If $s_1 \leq s_2$, then $\mathscr{H}^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow \mathscr{H}^{s_1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

Proposition 1.1.20. *If $s > d/2$, then $\mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

Proposition 1.1.21. *Let $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}), f(0) = 0, u \in \mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d), s \in \mathbb{N}, s > d$. Then we have $f(u) \in \mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Moreover if f vanishes at order $p+1$ at 0, where $p \in \mathbb{N}$, then $||f(u)||_{\mathscr{H}^s} \leq C||u||^{p+1}_{\mathscr{H}^s}$.*

Proof. Proposition 1.1.19 and 1.1.20 follow respectively from the definition and Sobolev embedding. By the chain rule, for $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq s$, $x^\alpha \partial^\beta f(u)$ may be written as the sum of terms of following form:

$$x^\alpha f^{(k)}(u)(\partial^{\beta_1} u) \dots (\partial^{\beta_k} u),$$

where $k \leq s, |\alpha| + \sum_{i=1}^k |\beta_i| \leq s, |\beta_i| > 0, i = 1, \dots, k$. Let j_0 be the index such that $|\beta_{j_0}|$ is the largest among $|\beta_1|, \dots, |\beta_k|$. Thus we must have $|\beta_i| \leq \frac{s}{2}$, $i \neq j_0$. By the assumption on s and proposition 1.1.20, $\partial^\gamma u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if $|\gamma| \leq \frac{d}{2}$. We then estimate the factor $x^\alpha \partial^{\beta_{j_0}} u$ of the above quantities in L^2-norm and others in L^∞-norm. Thus we have $f(u) \in \mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by proposition 1.1.20. When f vanishes at 0 at order $p+1$, by Taylor formula there is a smooth function h such that $f(u) = u^{p+1} h(u)$. Then we argue as above to get an upper bound of $||f(u)||_{\mathscr{H}^s}$ by $C||u||^p_{\mathscr{H}^s}||u||_{\mathscr{H}^s}$. This concludes the proof. ☐

Remark 1.1.3. *Proposition 1.1.21 actually holds true for $s > d/2$ if we argue as the proof of corollary 6.4.4 in [17]. Since we will consider only in $\mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for large s, the lower bound of s is not important.*

1.2 Statement of main theorem

Let d be an integer, $d \geq 1$ and $F : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ a real valued smooth function vanishing at order $\kappa + 1$ at 0, $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Let $m \in \mathbb{R}^*_+$. we consider the solution v of the following Cauchy problem:

$$(1.2.1) \qquad \begin{cases} (\partial_t^2 - \Delta + |x|^2 + m^2)v = F(v) \quad \text{on} \;\; [-T, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \\ v(0, x) = \epsilon v_0 \\ \partial_t v(0, x) = \epsilon v_1, \end{cases}$$

where $v_0 \in \mathscr{H}^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^d), v_1 \in \mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and $\epsilon > 0$ is a small parameter. By local existence theory one knows that if s is large enough and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, equation (1.2.1) admits for any (v_0, v_1) in the unit ball of $\mathscr{H}^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ a unique smooth solution defined on the interval $|t| \leq c\epsilon^{-\kappa}$, for some uniform positive constant c. Moreover, $||v(t, \cdot)||_{\mathscr{H}^{s+1}} + ||\partial_t v(t, \cdot)||_{\mathscr{H}^s}$ may be controlled by $C\epsilon$, for another uniform constant $C > 0$, on the interval of existence. The goal would be to obtain existence over an interval of longer length under convenient condition by controlling the Sobolev energy. Our main result is the following:

Theorem 1.2.1. *There is a zero measure subset $\mathcal{N}$ of $\mathbb{R}^*_+$ and for every $m \in \mathbb{R}^*_+ - \mathcal{N}$, there are $\epsilon_0 > 0, c > 0, s_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $s \geq s_0, s \in \mathbb{N}, \epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$, any pair (v_0, v_1) of real valued functions belonging to the unit ball of $\mathscr{H}^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$, problem (1.2.1) has a unique solution*

$$(1.2.2) \qquad u \in C^0((-T_\epsilon, T_\epsilon), \mathscr{H}^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)) \cap C^1((-T_\epsilon, T_\epsilon), \mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)),$$

where T_ϵ has a lower bound $T_\epsilon \geq c\epsilon^{-\frac{4}{3}(1-\rho)\kappa}$ for any $\rho > 0$ if $d \geq 2$ and $T_\epsilon \geq c\epsilon^{-\frac{25}{18}(1-\rho)\kappa}$ for any $\rho > 0$ if $d = 1$. Moreover, the solution is uniformly bounded in $\mathscr{H}^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ on $(-T_\epsilon, T_\epsilon)$ and $\partial_t u$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ on the same interval.

1.3 A property of spectral projectors on $\mathbb{R}^d$

As we have pointed out P has eigenvalues given by $\lambda_n = \sqrt{2n+d}, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Remark that Π_n is the orthogonal projector of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ onto the eigenspace associated to λ_n^2. Let us first introduce some notations. For $\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{p+1}$ $p+2$ nonnegative real numbers, let $\xi_{i_0}, \xi_{i_1}, \xi_{i_2}$ be respectively the largest, the second largest and the third largest elements among them and ξ' the largest element among $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_p$, that is,

$$\begin{gathered} \xi_{i_0} = \max\{\xi_0, \dots, \xi_{p+1}\}, \qquad \xi_{i_1} = \max(\{\xi_0, \dots, \xi_{p+1}\} - \{\xi_{i_0}\}), \\ \xi_{i_2} = \max(\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{p+1}\} - \{\xi_{i_0}, \xi_{i_1}\}), \qquad \xi' = \max\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_p\}. \end{gathered} \tag{1.3.1}$$

Denote

$$\mu(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_{p+1}) = (1 + \sqrt{\xi_{i_1}})(1 + \sqrt{\xi_{i_2}}). \tag{1.3.2}$$

Set also

$$S(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_{p+1}) = |\xi_{i_0} - \xi_{i_1}| + \mu(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_{p+1}). \tag{1.3.3}$$

The main result of this subsection is the following one:

Theorem 1.3.1. *There is a $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, depending only on p ($p \in \mathbb{N}^*$) and dimension d, and for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a $C_N > 0$ such that for any $n_0, \dots, n_{p+1} \in \mathbb{N}$, any $u_0, \dots, u_{p+1} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$,*

$$|\int \Pi_{n_0} u_0 \dots \Pi_{n_{p+1}} u_{p+1} dx| \le C_N (1 + \sqrt{n_{i_2}})^\nu \frac{\mu(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1})^N}{S(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1})^N} \prod_{j=0}^{p+1} ||u_j||_{L^2}. \tag{1.3.4}$$

Furthermore if $d = 1$, we may find for any $\varsigma \in (0,1)$

$$|\int \Pi_{n_0} u_0 \dots \Pi_{n_{p+1}} u_{p+1} dx| \le C_N \frac{(1 + \sqrt{n_{i_2}})^\nu}{(1 + \sqrt{n_{i_0}})^{\frac{1}{6}(1-\varsigma)}} \frac{\mu(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1})^N}{S(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1})^N} \prod_{j=0}^{p+1} ||u_j||_{L^2}. \tag{1.3.5}$$

Proof. By the symmetries we may assume $n_0 \ge n_1 \ge \dots \ge n_{p+1}$. Then recalling the definition of λ_n in (1.1.1), we only need to show under the condition of theorem 1.3.1

$$|\int \Pi_{n_0} u_0 \dots \Pi_{n_{p+1}} u_{p+1} dx| \le C_N \lambda_{n_2}^\nu \frac{(\lambda_{n_1} \lambda_{n_2})^N}{(|\lambda_{n_0}^2 - \lambda_{n_1}^2| + \lambda_{n_1} \lambda_{n_2})^N} \prod_{j=0}^{p+1} ||u_j||_{L^2} \tag{1.3.6}$$

and when $d = 1$

$$|\int \Pi_{n_0} u_0 \dots \Pi_{n_{p+1}} u_{p+1} dx| \le C_N \frac{\lambda_{n_2}^\nu}{\lambda_{n_0}^{\frac{1}{6}(1-\varsigma)}} \frac{(\lambda_{n_1} \lambda_{n_2})^N}{(|\lambda_{n_0}^2 - \lambda_{n_1}^2| + \lambda_{n_1} \lambda_{n_2})^N} \prod_{j=0}^{p+1} ||u_j||_{L^2} \tag{1.3.7}$$

for any $\varsigma \in (0,1)$. We follow the proof of proposition 3.6 in [14]. Let A be a linear operator which maps $D(P^{2k})$ into itself. We define a sequence of operators

$$A_N = [P^2, A_{N-1}]; \qquad A_0 = A. \tag{1.3.8}$$

Then using integration by parts we have

$$(\lambda_{n_0}^2 - \lambda_{n_1}^2)^N \langle A\ \Pi_{n_1} u_1, \Pi_{n_0} u_0 \rangle = \langle A_N \Pi_{n_1} u_1, \Pi_{n_0} u_0 \rangle. \tag{1.3.9}$$

Now we set A to be the multiplication operator generated by the function

$$a(x) = (\Pi_{n_2} u_2) \dots (\Pi_{n_{p+1}} u_{p+1}).$$

Then an induction argument shows

$$A_N = \sum_{|\beta|+|\gamma|\leq N,\ |\alpha|+|\beta|+|\gamma|\leq 2N} C_{\alpha\beta\gamma} (\partial^\alpha a) x^\beta \partial^\gamma \tag{1.3.10}$$

for constants $C_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$. Therefore we compute for some $\nu' > \frac{d}{2}$

$$\begin{aligned} &|(\lambda_{n_0}^2 - \lambda_{n_1}^2)^N \int (\Pi_{n_0} u_0) \dots (\Pi_{n_{p+1}} u_{p+1}) dx| \\ \leq C &\sum_{|\beta|+|\gamma|\leq N,\ |\alpha|+|\beta|+|\gamma|\leq 2N} ||(\partial^\alpha a) x^\beta \partial^\gamma \Pi_{n_1} u_1||_{L^2} ||\Pi_{n_0} u_0||_{L^2} \\ \leq C &\sum_{|\beta|+|\gamma|\leq N,\ |\alpha|+|\beta|+|\gamma|\leq 2N} ||a||_{\mathscr{H}^{\nu'+|\alpha|}} ||\Pi_{n_1} u_1||_{\mathscr{H}^{|\beta|+|\gamma|}} ||\Pi_{n_0} u_0||_{L^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{1.3.11}$$

where in the last estimate we used definition 1.1.2 and proposition 1.1.20. Remark that by definition 1.1.1, one has for any $s \geq 0$

$$||\Pi_n u||_{\mathscr{H}^s} \leq C \lambda_n^s ||\Pi_n u||_{L^2}. \tag{1.3.12}$$

This estimate together with the proof of proposition 1.1.21 gives for $n_2 \geq n_3 \cdots \geq n_{p+1}$

$$||a||_{\mathscr{H}^{\nu'+|\alpha|}} \leq C \lambda_{n_2}^{\nu+|\alpha|} \prod_{j=2}^{p+1} ||\Pi_{n_j} u_j||_{L^2} \tag{1.3.13}$$

for some $\nu > 0$ depending only on p and dimension d. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|(\lambda_{n_0}^2 - \lambda_{n_1}^2)^N \int (\Pi_{n_0} u_0) \dots (\Pi_{n_{p+1}} u_{p+1}) dx| \\ &\leq C \sum_{|\beta|+|\gamma|\leq N,\ |\alpha|+|\beta|+|\gamma|\leq 2N} \lambda_{n_2}^{\nu+|\alpha|} \lambda_{n_1}^{|\beta|+|\gamma|} \prod_{j=0}^{p+1} ||\Pi_{n_j} u_j||_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \sum_{|\alpha|\leq N} \lambda_{n_2}^{\nu+2N-|\alpha|} \lambda_{n_1}^{|\alpha|} \prod_{j=0}^{p+1} ||\Pi_{n_j} u_j||_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \lambda_{n_2}^{\nu+2N} (\frac{\lambda_{n_1}}{\lambda_{n_2}})^N \prod_{j=0}^{p+1} ||\Pi_{n_j} u_j||_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \lambda_{n_2}^{\nu} (\lambda_{n_1} \lambda_{n_2})^N \prod_{j=0}^{p+1} ||\Pi_{n_j} u_j||_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.3.14}$$

Now if $\lambda_{n_1}\lambda_{n_2} \leq |\lambda_{n_0}^2 - \lambda_{n_1}^2|$, then the last estimate implies (1.3.6), while if $\lambda_{n_1}\lambda_{n_2} > |\lambda_{n_0}^2 - \lambda_{n_1}^2|$, then $\frac{\lambda_{n_1}\lambda_{n_2}}{|\lambda_{n_0}^2 - \lambda_{n_1}^2| + \lambda_{n_1}\lambda_{n_2}} \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and thus (1.3.6) is trivially true.

On the other hand, we use the property of the eigenfunctions (see[19]), which in dimension $d = 1$ says that if ϕ_n is the eigenfunction associated to λ_n^2, then one has $||\phi_n||_{L^\infty} \leq C \lambda_n^{-\frac{1}{6}}$. Therefore we have

$$||\Pi_n u||_{L^\infty} \leq C \lambda_n^{-\frac{1}{6}} ||\Pi_n u||_{L^2} \tag{1.3.15}$$

since in this case the eigenvalues are simple. This estimate gives us

$$(1.3.16) \qquad |\int \Pi_{n_0} u_0 \dots \Pi_{n_{p+1}} u_{p+1} dx| \leq C \lambda_{n_0}^{-\frac{1}{6}} \prod_{j=0}^{p+1} ||\Pi_{n_j} u_j||_{L^2}.$$

Combining (1.3.16) with (1.3.6) one gets (1.3.7) for all $N \geq 1$ and some $\nu > 0$ in the case $d = 1$. This concludes the proof. ☐

2 Long time existence

2.1 Definition and properties of multilinear operators

Denote by $\mathcal{E}$ the algebraic direct sum of the ranges of the $\Pi_n{}'s, n \in \mathbb{N}$. With notations (1.3.1), (1.3.2) and (1.3.3) we give the following definition.

Definition 2.1.1. *Let $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_+,\ \tau \in \mathbb{R},\ p \in \mathbb{N}^*$. We denote by $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}^{\nu,\tau}$ the space of all $p+1$-linear operators $(u_1, \dots, u_{p+1}) \to M(u_1, \dots, u_{p+1})$, defined on $\mathcal{E} \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}$ with values in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that*

- *For every $(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{p+2}, u_1, \dots, u_{p+1} \in \mathcal{E}$*

  $$(2.1.1) \qquad \Pi_{n_0}[M(\Pi_{n_1} u_1, \dots, \Pi_{n_{p+1}} u_{p+1})] = 0,$$

  if $|n_0 - n_{p+1}| > \frac{1}{2}(n_0 + n_{p+1})$ or $n' \overset{def}{=} \max\{n_1, \dots, n_p\} > n_{p+1}$.

- *For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a $C > 0$ such that for every $(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{p+2}$, $u_1, \dots, u_{p+1} \in \mathcal{E}$, one has*

  $$(2.1.2) \qquad \begin{aligned} &||\Pi_{n_0}[M(\Pi_{n_1} u_1, \dots, \Pi_{n_{p+1}} u_{p+1})]||_{L^2} \\ &\leq C(1 + \sqrt{n_0} + \sqrt{n_{p+1}})^\tau (1 + \sqrt{n'})^\nu \frac{\mu(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1})^N}{S(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1})^N} \prod_{j=1}^{p+1} ||u_j||_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The best constant in the preceding inequality will be denoted by $||M||_{\mathcal{M}_{p+1,N}^{\nu,\tau}}$.

We may extend the operators in $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}^{\nu,\tau}$ to Sobolev spaces.

Proposition 2.1.2. *Let $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_+,\ \tau \in \mathbb{R},\ p \in \mathbb{N}^*,\ s \in \mathbb{N},\ s > \nu + 3$. Then any element $M \in \mathcal{M}_{p+1}^{\nu,\tau}$ extends as a bounded operator from $\mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \dots \times \mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to $\mathscr{H}^{s-\tau-1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Moreover, for any $s_0 \in (\nu + 3, s]$, there is $C > 0$ such that for any $M \in \mathcal{M}_{p+1}^{\nu,\tau}$, and any $u_1, \dots, u_{p+1} \in \mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$,*

$$(2.1.3) \qquad ||M(u_1, \dots, u_{p+1})||_{\mathscr{H}^{s-\tau-1}} \leq C ||M||_{\mathcal{M}_{p+1,N}^{\nu,\tau}} \sum_{j=1}^{p+1} \Big[||u_j||_{\mathscr{H}^s} \prod_{k \neq j} ||u_k||_{\mathscr{H}^{s_0}} \Big].$$

Proof. The proof is a modification of proposition 4.4 in [10]. There is one derivative lost compared to that case. We give it for the convenience of the reader. Using definition 1.1.1 we write

$$(2.1.4) \qquad \begin{aligned} &||M(u_1, \dots, u_{p+1})||^2_{\mathscr{H}^{s-\tau-1}} \\ &\leq C \sum_{n_0} || \sum_{n_1} \dots \sum_{n_{p+1}} \Pi_{n_0} M(\Pi_{n_1} u_1, \dots, \Pi_{n_{p+1}} u_{p+1})||^2_{L^2} (1 + \sqrt{n_0})^{2s - 2\tau - 2} \end{aligned}$$

Because of (2.1.1) and using the symmetries we may assume

$$n_0 \sim n_{p+1} \qquad \text{and} \qquad n_1 \leq \cdots \leq n_p \leq n_{p+1} \leq Cn_0 \tag{2.1.5}$$

when estimating the above quantity. Consequently, we have

$$\begin{gathered} \mu(n_0, \ldots, n_{p+1}) \sim (1+\sqrt{n_p})(1+\sqrt{n_{p+1}}), \\ S(n_0, \ldots, n_{p+1}) \sim |n_0 - n_{p+1}| + \mu(n_0, \ldots, n_{p+1}). \end{gathered} \tag{2.1.6}$$

By (2.1.2) the square root of the general term over n_0 sum in (2.1.4) is smaller than

$$C \sum_{n_1 \leq \cdots \leq n_{p+1}} (1+\sqrt{n_0})^{s-1} \frac{(1+\sqrt{n_p})^{\nu} \mu(n_0, \ldots, n_{p+1})^N}{S(n_0, \ldots, n_{p+1})^N} \prod_{1}^{p+1} ||\Pi_{n_j} u_j||_{L^2}. \tag{2.1.7}$$

We have by (2.1.5) and (2.1.6)

$$\frac{\mu(n_0, \ldots, n_{p+1})}{S(n_0, \ldots, n_{p+1})} \sim \frac{1+\sqrt{n_p}}{|\sqrt{n_0} - \sqrt{n_{p+1}}| + 1 + \sqrt{n_p}}. \tag{2.1.8}$$

The following fact will be useful in this section: For $q \in \mathbb{N}, A \geq 1$ and $N > 1$, there is a $C > 0$ independent of q and A such that

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{(|\sqrt{n} - \sqrt{q}| + A)^N} \leq C \frac{1+\sqrt{q}}{A^{N-2}}. \tag{2.1.9}$$

Let $\iota > 2$ be a constant as close to 2 as wanted. Using (2.1.8) and (2.1.9) we deduce

$$\begin{gathered} \sum_{n_0} \frac{\mu(n_0, \ldots, n_{p+1})^{\iota}}{S(n_0, \ldots, n_{p+1})^{\iota}} \leq C(1+\sqrt{n_{p+1}})(1+\sqrt{n_p})^2, \\ \sum_{n_{p+1}} \frac{\mu(n_0, \ldots, n_{p+1})^{\iota}}{S(n_0, \ldots, n_{p+1})^{\iota}} \leq C(1+\sqrt{n_0})(1+\sqrt{n_p})^2. \end{gathered} \tag{2.1.10}$$

We estimate the sum over $n_1 \leq \cdots \leq n_{p+1}$ in (2.1.7) by

$$\begin{gathered} C\Big(\sum_{n_1 \leq \cdots \leq n_{p+1}} \frac{(1+\sqrt{n_p})^{\nu} \mu^{\iota}}{S^{\iota}} \prod_{j=1}^{p} ||\Pi_{n_j} u_j||_{L^2} \Big)^{1/2} \\ \times \Big(\sum_{n_1 \leq \cdots \leq n_{p+1}} (1+\sqrt{n_0})^{2s-2} (1+\sqrt{n_p})^{\nu} \frac{\mu^{2N-\iota}}{S^{2N-\iota}} \prod_{j=1}^{p} ||\Pi_{n_j} u_j||_{L^2} ||\Pi_{n_{p+1}} u_{p+1}||_{L^2}^2 \Big)^{1/2}. \end{gathered} \tag{2.1.11}$$

Using (2.1.10) to handle n_{p+1} sum, we bound the first factor in (2.1.11) from above by $C(1+\sqrt{n_0})^{\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_{j=1}^{p} ||u_j||_{\mathscr{H}^{s_0}}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ if $s_0 > \nu + 3$ using definition 1.1.1. Incorporating $(1+\sqrt{n_0})^{\frac{1}{2}}$ into the second factor, we have to bound the quantity

$$\Big(\sum_{n_1 \leq \cdots \leq n_{p+1}} (1+\sqrt{n_0})^{2s-1} (1+\sqrt{n_p})^{\nu} \frac{\mu^{2N-\iota}}{S^{2N-\iota}} \prod_{j=1}^{p} ||\Pi_{n_j} u_j||_{L^2} ||\Pi_{n_{p+1}} u_{p+1}||_{L^2}^2 \Big)^{1/2}. \tag{2.1.12}$$

By (2.1.5) and $\mu \leq S$ we have

$$(1+\sqrt{n_0})^{2s-1} (\frac{\mu}{S})^{2N-\iota} \leq C(1+\sqrt{n_{p+1}})^{2s-1} (\frac{\mu}{S})^{\iota} \tag{2.1.13}$$

if $N > \iota$. Plugging in (2.1.12), (2.1.11) and then (2.1.4) we bound from above the n_0 sum in (2.1.4) by

(2.1.14)

$$C\prod_1^p ||u_j||_{\mathscr{H}^{s_0}} \sum_{n_1\leq\cdots\leq n_{p+1}\leq Cn_0} (1+\sqrt{n_{p+1}})^{2s-1}(1+\sqrt{n_p})^{\nu}(\frac{\mu}{S})^{\iota}\prod_{j=1}^p ||\Pi_{n_j}u_j||_{L^2}||\Pi_{n_{p+1}}u_{p+1}||_{L^2}^2.$$

Changing the order of sums for n_0 and n_{p+1}, we then use (2.1.10) to handle n_0 sum and get a control of (2.1.14) by $C\prod_{j=1}^p ||u_j||^2_{\mathscr{H}^{s_0}}||u_{p+1}||^2_{\mathscr{H}^s}$ according to definition 1.1.1 if $s > \nu + 3$. This concludes the proof. ☐

Let us define convenient subspaces of the spaces of definition 2.1.1.

Definition 2.1.3. *Let $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_+,\ \tau \in \mathbb{R},\ p \in \mathbb{N}^*, \omega : \{0, \dots, p+1\} \to \{-1, 1\}$ be given.*

- *If $\sum_{j=0}^{p+1}\omega(j) \neq 0$, we set $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\nu,\tau}_{p+1}(\omega) = \mathcal{M}^{\nu,\tau}_{p+1}$;*
- *If $\sum_{j=0}^{p+1}\omega(j) = 0$, we denote by $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\nu,\tau}_{p+1}(\omega)$ the closed subspace of $\mathcal{M}^{\nu,\tau}_{p+1}$ given by those $M \in \mathcal{M}^{\nu,\tau}_{p+1}$ such that*

  $$\Pi_{n_0}M(\Pi_{n_1}u_1, \dots, \Pi_{n_{p+1}}u_{p+1}) \equiv 0 \tag{2.1.15}$$

  for any $(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{p+2}$ such that there is a bijection σ from $\{j; 0 \leq j \leq p+1, \omega(j) = -1\}$ to $\{j; 0 \leq j \leq p+1, \omega(j) = 1\}$ so that for any j in the first set $n_{\sigma(j)} = n_j$.

We shall have to use also classes of remainder operators. If $n_1, \dots, n_{p+1} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j_0 \in \{1, \dots, p+1\}$ is such that $n_{j_0} = \max\{n_1, \dots, n_{p+1}\}$, we denote

$$\max\nolimits_2(\sqrt{n_1}, \dots, \sqrt{n_{p+1}}) = 1 + \max\{\sqrt{n_j};\ 1 \leq j \leq p+1, j \neq j_0\}. \tag{2.1.16}$$

Definition 2.1.4. *Let $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_+,\ \tau \in \mathbb{R},\ p \in \mathbb{N}^*$. We denote by $\mathcal{R}^{\nu,\tau}_{p+1}$ the space of $\mathbb{C}$ $(p+1)$-linear maps from $\mathcal{E} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{E} \to L^2(\mathbb{R}^d), (u_1, \dots, u_{p+1}) \to R(u_1, \dots, u_{p+1})$ such that for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a $C > 0$ such that for any $(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{p+2}$, any $u_1, \dots, u_{p+1} \in \mathcal{E}$,*

$$||\Pi_{n_0}R(\Pi_{n_1}u_1, \dots, \Pi_{n_{p+1}}u_{p+1})||_{L^2} \leq C(1+\sqrt{n_0})^{\tau}\frac{\max_2(\sqrt{n_1}, \dots, \sqrt{n_{p+1}})^{\nu+N}}{(1+\sqrt{n_0}+\cdots+\sqrt{n_{p+1}})^N}\prod_{j=1}^{p+1}||u_j||_{L^2}. \tag{2.1.17}$$

The elements in $\mathcal{R}^{\nu,\tau}_{p+1}$ also extend as bounded operators on Sobolev spaces.

Proposition 2.1.5. *Let $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_+,\ \tau \in \mathbb{R},\ p \in \mathbb{N}^*$ be given. There is $s_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $s \geq s_0$, any $R \in \mathcal{R}^{\nu,\tau}_{p+1}$, $(u_1, \dots, u_{p+1}) \to R(u_1, \dots, u_{p+1})$ extends as a bounded map from $\mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \cdots \times \mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d) \to \mathscr{H}^{2s-\nu-\tau-7}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Moreover one has*

$$||R(u_1, \dots, u_{p+1})||_{\mathscr{H}^{2s-\nu-\tau-7}} \leq C\sum_{1\leq j_1<j_2\leq p+1}\Big[||u_{j_1}||_{\mathscr{H}^s}||u_{j_2}||_{\mathscr{H}^s}\prod_{k\neq j_1, k\neq j_2}||u_k||_{\mathscr{H}^{s_0}}\Big]. \tag{2.1.18}$$

Proof. We may assume $\tau = 0$. By definition 1.1.1 we have to bound $||\Pi_{n_0}R(u_1, \dots, u_{p+1})||_{L^2}$ from above by $(1+\sqrt{n_0})^{-2s+\nu+7}c_{n_0}$ for a sequence $(c_{n_0})_{n_0}$ in ℓ^2. To do that we decompose u_j as $\sum_{n_j}\Pi_{n_j}u_j$ and use (2.1.17). By symmetry we limit ourselves to summation over

$$n_1 \leq \cdots \leq n_{p+1}, \tag{2.1.19}$$

from which we deduce

$$\max_2(\sqrt{n_1},\dots,\sqrt{n_{p+1}}) = 1+\sqrt{n_p}. \tag{2.1.20}$$

Therefore we are done if we can bound from above

$$C\sum_{n_1\le\cdots\le n_{p+1}} \frac{(1+\sqrt{n_p})^{\nu+N}}{(1+\sqrt{n_0}+\cdots+\sqrt{n_{p+1}})^N}\prod_{j=1}^{p-1}(1+\sqrt{n_j})^{-s_0}(1+\sqrt{n_p})^{-s}(1+\sqrt{n_{p+1}})^{-s} \tag{2.1.21}$$

by $(1+\sqrt{n_0})^{-2s+\nu+7}c_{n_0}$ for s_0, s large enough with $s\ge s_0$ since $||\Pi_{n_j}u_j||_{L^2}\le C(1+\sqrt{n_j})^{-s}||u_j||_{\mathscr{H}^s}$. Using (2.1.19) we get an upper bound of (2.1.21) by

$$C\sum_{n_1\le\cdots\le n_{p+1}} \frac{(1+\sqrt{n_p})^{\nu+N-2s}}{(1+\sqrt{n_0}+\sqrt{n_{p+1}})^N}\prod_{j=1}^{p-1}(1+\sqrt{n_j})^{-s_0} \tag{2.1.22}$$

Using the fact $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\frac{1}{(\sqrt{n}+A)^N}\le\frac{C}{A^{N-2}}$ for $N>2$ and $A\ge 1$, we take the sum over n_{p+1} to get an upper bound of (2.1.21) by

$$C\sum_{n_1\le\cdots\le n_p} \frac{(1+\sqrt{n_p})^{\nu+N-2s}}{(1+\sqrt{n_0})^{N-2}}\prod_{j=1}^{p-1}(1+\sqrt{n_j})^{-s_0} \tag{2.1.23}$$

if $N>2$. Now take $N=2s-\nu-\frac{5}{2}$ and sum over $n_1,\dots,n_p$. This gives the upper bound we want and thus concludes the proof. ☐

Definition 2.1.6. *Let $\nu\in\mathbb{R}_+,\ \tau\in\mathbb{R},\ p\in\mathbb{N}^*, \omega:\{0,\dots,p+1\}\to\{-1,1\}$ be given.*

- *If $\sum_{j=0}^{p+1}\omega(j)\neq 0$, we set $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\nu,\tau}_{p+1}(\omega)=\mathcal{R}^{\nu,\tau}_{p+1}$;*
- *If $\sum_{j=0}^{p+1}\omega(j)=0$, we denote by $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\nu,\tau}_{p+1}(\omega)$ the closed subspace of $\mathcal{R}^{\nu,\tau}_{p+1}$ given by those $R\in\mathcal{M}^{\nu,\tau}_{p+1}$ such that*

  $$\Pi_{n_0}R(\Pi_{n_1}u_1,\dots,\Pi_{n_{p+1}}u_{p+1})\equiv 0 \tag{2.1.24}$$

  for any $(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})\in\mathbb{N}^{p+2}$ such that there is a bijection σ from $\{j; 0\le j\le p+1, \omega(j)=-1\}$ to $\{j; 0\le j\le p+1, \omega(j)=1\}$ so that for any j in the first set $n_{\sigma(j)}=n_j$.

2.2 Rewriting of the equation and the energy

In this subsection we will write the time derivative of the energy in terms of multilinear operators defined in the previous subsection. To do that, we shall need to analyze the nonlinearity. Decompose

$$-F(v) = -\sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\frac{\partial_v^{p+1}F(0)}{(p+1)!}v^{p+1}+G(v) \tag{2.2.1}$$

where $G(v)$ vanishes at order $2\kappa+1$ at $v=0$. One has

$$cv^{p+1} = c\sum_{n_1}\cdots\sum_{n_{p+1}}(\Pi_{n_1}v)\dots(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}v)$$

for a real constant c. One may also write this as $A_p(v)\cdot v$ where $A_p(v)$ is an operator of form

$$A_p(v)\cdot w = \sum_{n_1}\cdots\sum_{n_{p+1}} B(n_1,\dots,n_{p+1})(\Pi_{n_1}v)\dots(\Pi_{n_p}v)(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}w), \tag{2.2.2}$$

where $B(n_1,\dots,n_{p+1})$ is a real valued bounded function supported on $\max\{n_1,\dots,n_p\}\le n_{p+1}$ and B is constant valued on the domain $\max\{n_1,\dots,n_p\}<n_{p+1}$. For instance, when $p=2$, one may write

$$\{(n_1,n_2,n_3);n_j\in\mathbb{N}\}=\{\max\{n_1,n_2\}\le n_3\}\cup\{n_1\ge n_2 \text{ and } n_1>n_3\}\cup\{n_1<n_2 \text{ and } n_2>n_3\}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n_1}\sum_{n_2}\sum_{n_3}(\Pi_{n_1}v)(\Pi_{n_2}v)(\Pi_{n_3}v) &= \sum \mathbf{1}_{\{\max\{n_1,n_2\}\le n_3\}}(\Pi_{n_1}v)(\Pi_{n_2}v)(\Pi_{n_3}v)\\ &+\sum \mathbf{1}_{\{n_3\ge n_2 \text{ and } n_3>n_1\}}(\Pi_{n_1}v)(\Pi_{n_2}v)(\Pi_{n_3}v)+\sum \mathbf{1}_{\{n_3> n_2 \text{ and } n_3>n_1\}}(\Pi_{n_1}v)(\Pi_{n_2}v)(\Pi_{n_3}v)\end{aligned}$$

using the symmetries, so that in this case

$$B(n_1,n_2,n_3)=c(\mathbf{1}_{\{\max\{n_1,n_2\}\le n_3\}}+\mathbf{1}_{\{n_3\ge n_2 \text{ and } n_3>n_1\}}+\mathbf{1}_{\{n_3> n_2 \text{ and } n_3>n_1\}}).$$

So if we make a change of unknown $u=(D_t+\Lambda_m)v$ with

$$D_t=-i\partial_t,\qquad \Lambda_m=\sqrt{-\Delta+|x|^2+m^2},$$

we may write using (2.2.1)

$$(D_t-\Lambda_m)u=-\sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}A_p\Big(\Lambda_m^{-1}(\frac{u+\bar u}{2})\Big)\Lambda_m^{-1}(\frac{u+\bar u}{2})+G\Big(\Lambda_m^{-1}(\frac{u+\bar u}{2})\Big). \tag{2.2.3}$$

Denote $C(u,\bar u)=-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}A_p\Big(\Lambda_m^{-1}(\frac{u+\bar u}{2})\Big)\Lambda_m^{-1}$ so that

$$(D_t-\Lambda_m)u=C(u,\bar u)u+C(u,\bar u)\bar u+G\Big(\Lambda_m^{-1}(\frac{u+\bar u}{2})\Big). \tag{2.2.4}$$

We have to estimate for the solution u of (2.2.3)

$$\Theta_s(u(t,\cdot))=\frac{1}{2}\langle\Lambda_m^s u(t,\cdot),\Lambda_m^s u(t,\cdot)\rangle. \tag{2.2.5}$$

Now comes the main result of this subsection:

Proposition 2.2.1. *There are $\nu\in\mathbb{R}_+$ and large enough s_0 such that for any natural number $s\ge s_0$, there are:*

- *Multilinear operators $M_\ell^p\in\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{p+1}^{\nu,2s-a}(\omega_\ell)$, $\kappa\le p\le 2\kappa-1$, $0\le\ell\le p$ with ω_ℓ defined by $\omega_\ell(j)=-1$, $j=0,\dots,\ell$, $\omega_\ell(j)=1, j=\ell+1,\dots,p+1$ and $a=2$ if $d\ge 2$ and $a=\frac{13}{6}-\varsigma$ for any $\varsigma\in(0,1)$ if $d=1$;*
- *Multilinear operators $\widetilde{M}_\ell^p\in\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{p+1}^{\nu,2s-1}(\widetilde{\omega}_\ell)$, $\kappa\le p\le 2\kappa-1$, $0\le\ell\le p$ with $\widetilde{\omega}_\ell$ defined by $\widetilde{\omega}_\ell(j)=-1$, $j=0,\dots,\ell,p+1$, $\widetilde{\omega}_\ell(j)=1, j=\ell+1,\dots,p$;*

- *Multilinear operators* $R^p_\ell \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\nu,2s}_{p+1}(\omega_\ell), \widetilde{R}^p_\ell \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\nu,2s}_{p+1}(\widetilde{\omega}_\ell)$*,* $\kappa \leq p \leq 2\kappa - 1$*,* $0 \leq \ell \leq p$*;*
- *A map* $u \to T(u)$ *defined on* $\mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ *with values in* $\mathbb{R}$*, satisfying when* $||u||_{\mathscr{H}^s} \leq 1$*,* $|T(u)| \leq C||u||^{2\kappa+2}_{\mathscr{H}^s}$

such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\Theta_s(u(t,\cdot)) = \sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\ i\langle M^p_\ell(\underbrace{\bar{u},\dots,\bar{u}}_{\ell},\underbrace{u,\dots,u}_{p+1-\ell}),u\rangle \\
&+ \sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\ i\langle \widetilde{M}^p_\ell(\underbrace{\bar{u},\dots,\bar{u}}_{\ell},\underbrace{u,\dots,u}_{p-\ell},\bar{u}),u\rangle + \sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\ i\langle R^p_\ell(\underbrace{\bar{u},\dots,\bar{u}}_{\ell},\underbrace{u,\dots,u}_{p+1-\ell}),u\rangle \\
&+ \sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\ i\langle \widetilde{R}^p_\ell(\underbrace{\bar{u},\dots,\bar{u}}_{\ell},\underbrace{u,\dots,u}_{p-\ell},\bar{u}),u\rangle + T(u).
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.2.6}
$$

Proof. We compute according to (2.2.4)

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\Theta_s(u(t,\cdot)) &= Re\ i\langle \Lambda^s_m D_t u, \Lambda^s_m u\rangle \\
&= Re\ i\langle \Lambda^s_m C(u,\bar{u})u, \Lambda^s_m u\rangle + Re\ i\langle \Lambda^s_m C(u,\bar{u})\bar{u}, \Lambda^s_m u\rangle + Re\ i\langle \Lambda^s_m G(\Lambda^{-1}_m(\frac{u+\bar{u}}{2})), \Lambda^s_m u\rangle.
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.2.7}
$$

The last term in the right hand side of (2.2.7) contributes to the last term in (2.2.6) by proposition 1.1.21. Let us treat the other two terms in the right hand side of (2.2.7).

Lemma 2.2.2. *There are* $M^p_\ell \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\nu,2s-a}_{p+1}(\omega_\ell)$*,* $R^p_\ell \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\nu,2s}_{p+1}(\omega_\ell)$*,* $\kappa \leq p \leq 2\kappa-1$*,* $0 \leq \ell \leq p$ *with* ω_ℓ *defined by* $\omega_\ell(j) = -1$*,* $j = 0,\dots,\ell$*,* $\omega_\ell(j) = 1, j = \ell+1,\dots,p+1$ *and* $a = 2$ *if* $d \geq 2$ *and* $a = \frac{13}{6} - \varsigma$ *for any* $\varsigma \in (0,1)$ *if* $d = 1$*, such that*

$$
\begin{aligned}
Re\ i\langle \Lambda^s_m C(u,\bar{u})u, \Lambda^s_m u\rangle &= \sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\ i\langle M^p_\ell(\underbrace{\bar{u},\dots,\bar{u}}_{\ell},\underbrace{u,\dots,u}_{p+1-\ell}),u\rangle \\
&+ \sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\ i\langle R^p_\ell(\underbrace{\bar{u},\dots,\bar{u}}_{\ell},\underbrace{u,\dots,u}_{p+1-\ell}),u\rangle.
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.2.8}
$$

Proof of Lemma 2.2.2: Let χ be a cut-off function near 0 with small support and λ_n defined in (1.1.1). We may decompose the operator $A_p(v)$ defined in (2.2.2) as

$$
A_p(v) = A^1_p(v) + A^2_p(v) + A^3_p(v),
\tag{2.2.9}
$$

where $A^j_p(v)(j = 1,2,3)$ are operators of form

$$
\begin{aligned}
A^1_p(v)\cdot w &= \sum_{n_0}\cdots\sum_{n_{p+1}} B_1(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})\Pi_{n_0}[(\Pi_{n_1}v)\dots(\Pi_{n_p}v)(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}w)], \\
A^2_p(v)\cdot w &= \sum_{n_0}\cdots\sum_{n_{p+1}} B_2(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})\Pi_{n_0}[(\Pi_{n_1}v)\dots(\Pi_{n_p}v)(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}w)], \\
A^3_p(v)\cdot w &= \sum_{n_1}\cdots\sum_{n_{p+1}} B_3(n_1,\dots,n_{p+1})\Pi_{n_0}[(\Pi_{n_1}v)\dots(\Pi_{n_p}v)(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}w)],
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.2.10}
$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
&B_1(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) = B(n_1,\dots,n_{p+1})\chi\Big(\frac{|\lambda_{n_0}^2-\lambda_{n_{p+1}}^2|}{\lambda_{n_0}^2+\lambda_{n_{p+1}}^2}\Big)\mathbf{1}_{\{\max\{n_1,\dots,n_p\}<\delta n_{p+1}\}},\\
&B_2(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) = B(n_1,\dots,n_{p+1})\Big(1-\chi\Big(\frac{|\lambda_{n_0}^2-\lambda_{n_{p+1}}^2|}{\lambda_{n_0}^2+\lambda_{n_{p+1}}^2}\Big)\Big)\mathbf{1}_{\{\max\{n_1,\dots,n_p\}<\delta n_{p+1}\}},\\
&B_3(n_1,\dots,n_{p+1}) = B(n_1,\dots,n_{p+1})\mathbf{1}_{\{\max\{n_1,\dots,n_p\}\geq\delta n_{p+1}\}},
\end{aligned}\tag{2.2.11}$$

with some small $\delta > 0$. Therefore for the operator $C(u,\bar{u})$ defined above (2.2.4), we have

$$C(u,\bar{u}) = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{3}\sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1} A_p^j\Big(\Lambda_m^{-1}(\frac{u+\bar{u}}{2})\Big)\Lambda_m^{-1}.\tag{2.2.12}$$

So the left hand side of (2.2.8) may be written as

$$-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{3}\sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1} Re\ i\langle\Lambda_m^{2s}A_p^j\Big(\Lambda_m^{-1}(\frac{u+\bar{u}}{2})\Big)\Lambda_m^{-1}u,u\rangle := \sum_{j=1}^{3}\sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1} I_p^j.\tag{2.2.13}$$

Let us treat these quantities term by term.

(i) The term I_p^1.
Note that $-4I_p^1$ equals to

$$Re\ i\langle\Big[\Lambda_m^{2s}A_p^1\Big(\Lambda_m^{-1}(\frac{u+\bar{u}}{2})\Big)\Lambda_m^{-1}-\Big(A_p^1\Big(\Lambda_m^{-1}(\frac{u+\bar{u}}{2})\Big)\Lambda_m^{-1}\Big)^*\Lambda_m^{2s}\Big]u,u\rangle,\tag{2.2.14}$$

which may be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
&Re\ i\langle\Big[\Lambda_m^{2s},A_p^1\Big(\Lambda_m^{-1}(\frac{u+\bar{u}}{2})\Big)\Lambda_m^{-1}\Big]u,u\rangle\\
&+Re\ i\langle\Big[A_p^1\Big(\Lambda_m^{-1}(\frac{u+\bar{u}}{2})\Big)\Lambda_m^{-1}-\Big(A_p^1\Big(\Lambda_m^{-1}(\frac{u+\bar{u}}{2})\Big)\Lambda_m^{-1}\Big)^*\Big]\Lambda_m^{2s}u,u\rangle := I+II
\end{aligned}\tag{2.2.15}$$

We expand the first term in (2.2.15) using (2.2.10) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
I &= Re\ i\langle\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}^{p+2}}\pi_1\Pi_{n_0}\Big[\Big(\Pi_{n_1}\Lambda_m^{-1}(\frac{u+\bar{u}}{2})\Big)\dots\Big(\Pi_{n_p}\Lambda_m^{-1}(\frac{u+\bar{u}}{2})\Big)\Big(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}\Lambda_m^{-1}u\Big)\Big],u\rangle\\
&= Re\ i\langle\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}^{p+2}}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p}\pi_2\Pi_{n_0}[(\Pi_{n_1}\Lambda_m^{-1}\bar{u})\dots(\Pi_{n_\ell}\Lambda_m^{-1}\bar{u})(\Pi_{n_{\ell+1}}\Lambda_m^{-1}u)\dots(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}\Lambda_m^{-1}u)],u\rangle\\
&= Re\ i\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}^{p+2}}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p}\pi_2\int(\Pi_{n_0}\bar{u})(\Pi_{n_1}\Lambda_m^{-1}\bar{u})\dots(\Pi_{n_\ell}\Lambda_m^{-1}\bar{u})(\Pi_{n_{\ell+1}}\Lambda_m^{-1}u)\dots(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}\Lambda_m^{-1}u)dx,
\end{aligned}\tag{2.2.16}$$

where we have used notations

$$\begin{aligned}
&n = (n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}),\\
&\pi_1 = B_1(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})[(m^2+\lambda_{n_0}^2)^s-(m^2+\lambda_{n_{p+1}}^2)^s],
\end{aligned}\tag{2.2.17}$$

$$\pi_2 = \frac{1}{2^p}\binom{p}{\ell} B_1(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})[(m^2+\lambda_{n_0}^2)^s - (m^2+\lambda_{n_{p+1}}^2)^s].$$

Let ω_ℓ be defined in the statement of the lemma and set

$$\begin{aligned} S_p^\ell = \{(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{p+2};\ &\text{there exists a bijection } \sigma \text{ from} \\ \{j; 0\le j\le p+1, \omega_\ell(j)=-1\} &\text{ to } \{j; 0\le j\le p+1, \omega_\ell(j)=1\} \\ &\text{such that for each } j \text{ in the first set } n_j = n_{\sigma(j)}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2.18}$$

Now we look at the integral in the last line of (2.2.16). If $n \in S_p^\ell$ with $S_p^\ell \neq \emptyset$, there is a bijection σ from $\{0,\dots,\ell\}$ to $\{\ell,\dots,p+1\}$ such that $n_j = n_{\sigma(j)}, j = 0,\dots,\ell$. So we may couple $\Pi_{n_j}\bar{u}, j=0,\dots,\ell$ with $\Pi_{n_{\sigma(j)}}u, j=0,\dots,\ell$. Since π_2 is real, we get zero if we take the sum over $n \in S_p^\ell$ when computing the right hand side of (2.2.16). Therefore we may assume $n \notin S_p^\ell$ when computing I. Now we define

$$M_\ell^{p,1}(u_1,\dots,u_{p+1}) = -\frac{1}{4}\sum_{n\notin S_p^\ell} \pi_2 \Pi_{n_0}[(\Pi_{n_1}\Lambda_m^{-1}u_1)\dots(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}\Lambda_m^{-1}u_{p+1})]. \tag{2.2.19}$$

It follows from the second equality in (2.2.16) that

$$I = -4\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\ i\langle M_\ell^{p,1}(\underbrace{\bar{u},\dots,\bar{u}}_{\ell},\underbrace{u,\dots,u}_{p+1-\ell}),u\rangle. \tag{2.2.20}$$

Let us turn to the term II in (2.2.15). Note that $A_p^1(v)^*$ is an operator of form

$$A_p^1(v)^*\cdot w = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}^{p+2}} B_1(n_{p+1},n_1,\dots,n_p,n_0)\Pi_{n_0}[(\Pi_{n_1}v)\dots(\Pi_{n_p}v)(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}w)]. \tag{2.2.21}$$

Thus we may compute using (2.2.10)

(2.2.22)

$$\begin{aligned} II &= Re\ i\langle \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}^{p+2}}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} \pi_3\Pi_{n_0}[(\Pi_{n_1}\Lambda_m^{-1}\bar{u})\dots(\Pi_{n_\ell}\Lambda_m^{-1}\bar{u})(\Pi_{n_{\ell+1}}\Lambda_m^{-1}u)\dots(\Pi_{n_p}\Lambda_m^{-1}u)(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}\Lambda_m^{2s}u)],u\rangle \\ &= Re\ i\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}^{p+2}}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p}\pi_3\int(\Pi_{n_0}\bar{u})(\Pi_{n_1}\Lambda_m^{-1}\bar{u})\dots(\Pi_{n_\ell}\Lambda_m^{-1}\bar{u})(\Pi_{n_{\ell+1}}\Lambda_m^{-1}u)\dots(\Pi_{n_p}\Lambda_m^{-1}u)(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}\Lambda_m^{2s}u)dx, \end{aligned}$$

where

(2.2.23)

$$\pi_3 = \frac{1}{2^p}\binom{p}{\ell}[B_1(n_0,n_1,\dots,n_p,n_{p+1})(m^2+\lambda_{n_{p+1}}^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - B_1(n_{p+1},n_1,\dots,n_p,n_0)(m^2+\lambda_{n_0}^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}].$$

With the same reasoning as in the paragraph above (2.2.19) we get zero if we take the sum over $n \in S_p^\ell$ when computing the right hand side of (2.2.22). So we may assume $n \notin S_p^\ell$ and define

$$M_\ell^{p,2}(u_1,\dots,u_{p+1}) = -\frac{1}{4}\sum_{n\notin S_p^\ell}\pi_3\Pi_{n_0}[(\Pi_{n_1}\Lambda_m^{-1}u_1)\dots(\Pi_{n_p}\Lambda_m^{-1}u_p)(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}\Lambda_m^{2s}u_{p+1})]. \tag{2.2.24}$$

It follows from (2.2.22) that

$$II = -4\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\ i\langle M_\ell^{p,2}(\underbrace{\bar{u},\dots,\bar{u}}_{\ell},\underbrace{u,\dots,u}_{p+1-\ell}),u\rangle. \tag{2.2.25}$$

Let us check that $M_\ell^{p,1}, M_\ell^{p,2} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{p+1}^{\nu,2s-a}(\omega_\ell)$ for some $\nu > 0$, where $a = 2$ if $d \geq 2$ and $a = \frac{13}{6} - \varsigma$ for any $\varsigma \in (0,1)$ if $d = 1$. Since the function $B_1(n_0,\dots,n_{n_{p+1}})$ is supported on domain $n' = \max\{n_1,\dots,n_p\} < \delta n_{p+1}$ and $n_0 \sim n_{p+1}$ (this is because of the cut-off function and (1.1.1)), we see that (2.1.1) holds true if $supp\chi$ and δ are small. Let us use theorem 1.3.1 to show that (2.1.2) holds true with $\tau = 2s - a$ for $M_\ell^{p,1}$ and $M_\ell^{p,2}$. Remark that we have

$$|\pi_2| \leq C(1 + |\sqrt{n_0} - \sqrt{n_{p+1}}|)(1 + \sqrt{n_0} + \sqrt{n_{p+1}})^{2s-1}, \tag{2.2.26}$$

$$|\pi_3| \leq C(1 + \sqrt{n'})^2(1 + |\sqrt{n_0} - \sqrt{n_{p+1}}|)(1 + \sqrt{n_0} + \sqrt{n_{p+1}})^{-2}. \tag{2.2.27}$$

Indeed, (2.2.26) follows from the fact

$$|(m^2 + \lambda_{n_0}^2)^s - (m^2 + \lambda_{n_{p+1}}^2)^s| \leq C(|\lambda_{n_0} - \lambda_{n_{p+1}}|)(1 + \lambda_{n_0} + \lambda_{n_{p+1}})^{2s-1}.$$

If $n' < \delta n_0$ and $n' < \delta n_{p+1}$ for small $\delta > 0$, then

$$B_1(n_0, n_1, \dots, n_p, n_{p+1}) = B_1(n_{p+1}, n_1, \dots, n_p, n_0)$$

since $B(n_1,\dots,n_{p+1})$ is constant valued on the domain $n' < n_{p+1}$. Thus (2.2.27) follows from the fact

$$|(m^2 + \lambda_{n_0}^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - (m^2 + \lambda_{n_{p+1}}^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}| \leq C(|\lambda_{n_0} - \lambda_{n_{p+1}}|)(1 + \lambda_{n_0} + \lambda_{n_{p+1}})^{-2}.$$

Otherwise, assume $n' \geq \delta n_0$ or $n' \geq \delta n_{p+1}$. Then we must have $n' \geq C n_0$ and $n' \geq C n_{p+1}$ if B_1 is non zero, since $n_0 \sim n_{p+1}$ which is because of the cut-off function. In this case, (2.2.27) holds true trivially.

Moreover, on the support of $\Pi_{n_0} M_\ell^{p,l}(\Pi_{n_1}u_1, \dots, \Pi_{n_{p+1}}u_{p+1})(l = 1,2)$, i.e., $n_0 \sim n_{p+1}$ and $n_{p+1} \geq \max\{n_1,\dots,n_p\} = n'$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \sqrt{n_{i_2}} &\sim 1 + \sqrt{n'}, \\ \mu(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) &\sim (1 + \sqrt{n_{p+1}})(1 + \sqrt{n'}), \\ S(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) &\sim |n_0 - n_{p+1}| + (1 + \sqrt{n_{p+1}})(1 + \sqrt{n'}), \end{aligned} \tag{2.2.28}$$

from which we deduce

$$\frac{\mu(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})}{S(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})} \sim \frac{1 + \sqrt{n'}}{|\sqrt{n_0} - \sqrt{n_{p+1}}| + 1 + \sqrt{n'}}. \tag{2.2.29}$$

Thus

$$(1 + |\sqrt{n_0} - \sqrt{n_{p+1}}|)\frac{\mu(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})}{S(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})} \leq C(1 + \sqrt{n'}).$$

Then we use theorem 1.3.1 (with dimension $d \geq 2$) to get for $l = 1, 2$

(2.2.30)

$$\begin{aligned} &||\Pi_{n_0} M_\ell^{p,l}(\Pi_{n_1}u_1, \dots, \Pi_{n_{p+1}}u_{p+1})||_{L^2} \\ &\leq C(1 + \sqrt{n_0} + \sqrt{n_{p+1}})^{2s-2}(1 + \sqrt{n'})^{\nu+2}(1 + |\sqrt{n_0} - \sqrt{n_{p+1}}|)\frac{\mu(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})^N}{S(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})^N}\prod_{j=1}^{p+1}||u_j||_{L^2} \\ &\leq C(1 + \sqrt{n_0} + \sqrt{n_{p+1}})^{2s-2}(1 + \sqrt{n'})^{\nu+3}\frac{\mu(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})^{N-1}}{S(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})^{N-1}}\prod_{j=1}^{p+1}||u_j||_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

So $M_\ell^{p,l} \in \mathcal{M}_\ell^{\nu,2s-2}$ for some other $\nu > 0$ in dimension $d \geq 2$. The case of dimension one is similar. (2.1.15) with $\omega = \omega_\ell$ is satisfied by definition. Thus $M_\ell^{p,1}, M_\ell^{p,2} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{p+1}^{\nu,2s-a}(\omega_\ell)$ and we have proved

$$I_p^1 = \sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\ i\langle M_\ell^{p,1}(\underbrace{\bar{u},\dots,\bar{u}}_{\ell},\underbrace{u,\dots,u}_{p+1-\ell}), u\rangle + \sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\ i\langle M_\ell^{p,2}(\underbrace{\bar{u},\dots,\bar{u}}_{\ell},\underbrace{u,\dots,u}_{p+1-\ell}), u\rangle. \tag{2.2.31}$$

(ii) The term I_p^2.

Using (2.2.10) we get

(2.2.32)

$$\begin{aligned}
-2I_p^2 &= Re\ i\langle \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}^{p+2}} \sum_{\ell=0}^{p} \pi_4 \Lambda_m^{2s} \Pi_{n_0}[(\Pi_{n_1}\Lambda_m^{-1}\bar{u})\dots(\Pi_{n_\ell}\Lambda_m^{-1}\bar{u})(\Pi_{n_{\ell+1}}\Lambda_m^{-1}u)\dots(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}\Lambda_m^{-1}u)], u\rangle \\
&= Re\ i \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}^{p+2}} \sum_{\ell=0}^{p} \pi_4 \int (\Pi_{n_0}\Lambda_m^{2s}\bar{u})(\Pi_{n_1}\Lambda_m^{-1}\bar{u})\dots(\Pi_{n_\ell}\Lambda_m^{-1}\bar{u})(\Pi_{n_{\ell+1}}\Lambda_m^{-1}u)\dots(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}\Lambda_m^{-1}u)dx
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\pi_4 = \frac{1}{2^p}\binom{p}{\ell} B_2(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}).$$

We may rule out the sum over $n \in S_p^\ell$ in the above computation with the same reasoning as in the paragraph above (2.2.19). Thus if we define

$$R_\ell^{p,1}(u_1,\dots,u_{p+1}) = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{n\notin S_p^\ell} \pi_4 \Lambda_m^{2s}\Pi_{n_0}[(\Pi_{n_1}\Lambda_m^{-1}u_1)\dots(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}\Lambda_m^{-1}u_{p+1})], \tag{2.2.33}$$

we have

$$I_p^2 = \sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\ i\langle R_\ell^{p,1}(\underbrace{\bar{u},\dots,\bar{u}}_{\ell},\underbrace{u,\dots,u}_{p+1-\ell}), u\rangle. \tag{2.2.34}$$

From the support property of function $B_2(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})$ we know that $\Pi_{n_0}R_\ell^{p,1}(\Pi_{n_1}u_1,\dots,\Pi_{n_{p+1}}u_{p+1})$ is supported on $\max\{n_1,\dots,n_p\} < \delta n_{p+1}$ and $|n_0 - n_{p+1}| \geq c(n_0 + n_{p+1})$ for some small $c > 0$. Therefore, on its support, if $n_0 > Cn_{p+1}$ for a large C, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) &= (1+\sqrt{n_{p+1}})(1+\sqrt{n'}) \leq (1+\sqrt{n_0})(1+\sqrt{n'}), \\
S(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) &= |n_0 - n_{p+1}| + (1+\sqrt{n_{p+1}})(1+\sqrt{n'}) \sim (1+\sqrt{n_0})^2
\end{aligned}$$

and if $n_0 \leq Cn_{p+1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) &\leq (1+\sqrt{n'})(1+\sqrt{n_{p+1}}), \\
S(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) &\geq c(|n_0 - n_{p+1}|) \geq c(n_0 + n_{p+1}) \sim (1+\sqrt{n_{p+1}})^2.
\end{aligned}$$

In both cases we have

$$\frac{\mu(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})}{S(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})} \leq C\frac{1+\sqrt{n'}}{1+\sqrt{n_0}+\dots+\sqrt{n_{p+1}}} = C\frac{\max_2(\sqrt{n_1},\dots,\sqrt{n_{p+1}})}{1+\sqrt{n_0}+\dots+\sqrt{n_{p+1}}}, \tag{2.2.35}$$

where $\max_2(\sqrt{n_1},\dots,\sqrt{n_{p+1}})$ is defined above definition 2.1.4. Thus theorem 1.3.1 allows us to get (2.1.17) with $\tau = 2s$ and some $\nu > 0$. (2.1.24) with $\omega = \omega_\ell$ is satisfied by the definition of $R_\ell^{p,1}$. So $R_\ell^{p,1} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{p+1}^{\nu,2s}(\omega_\ell)$.

(iii) The term I^3_p.

The treatment of I^3_p is similar to that of I^2_p. The only difference is that we have different support for B_2 and B_3. So we define

$$R^{p,2}_\ell(u_1,\dots,u_{p+1}) = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{n\notin S^\ell_p} \pi_5 \Lambda_m^{2s}\Pi_{n_0}[(\Pi_{n_1}\Lambda_m^{-1}u_1)\dots(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}\Lambda_m^{-1}u_{p+1})] \tag{2.2.36}$$

with π_5 given by

$$\pi_5 = \frac{1}{2^p}\binom{p}{\ell} B_3(n_1,\dots,n_{p+1}) \tag{2.2.37}$$

and we get

$$I^3_p = \sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\ i\langle R^{p,2}_\ell(\underbrace{\bar u,\dots,\bar u}_{\ell},\underbrace{u,\dots,u}_{p+1-\ell}),u\rangle. \tag{2.2.38}$$

From the support property of B_3 we know that $\Pi_{n_0}R^{p,2}_\ell(\Pi_{n_1}u_1,\dots,\Pi_{n_{p+1}}u_{p+1})$ is supported on domain $\delta n_{p+1} \le \max\{n_1,\dots,n_p\} = n' \le n_{p+1}$. So on this domain we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) &\le (1+\sqrt{n_{p+1}})(1+\sqrt{n'}),\\ S(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) &\sim (1+\sqrt{n_0}+\sqrt{n_{p+1}})^2,\end{aligned}$$

from which we deduce

$$\frac{\mu(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})}{S(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})} \le C\frac{1+\sqrt{n'}}{1+\sqrt{n_0}+\dots+\sqrt{n_{p+1}}}. \tag{2.2.39}$$

Thus we have by theorem 1.3.1, for any $N\in\mathbb{N}$, there exists $C_N>0$, such that (2.1.17) holds true with $\tau = 2s$ and some $\nu>0$. On the other hand, (2.1.24) with $\omega=\omega_\ell$ is satisfied by the definition. So $R^{p,2}_\ell \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\nu,2s}_{p+1}(\omega_\ell)$.

Taking M^p_ℓ to be the sum of $M^{p,1}_\ell$ and $M^{p,2}_\ell$, and R^p_ℓ the sum of $R^{p,1}_\ell$ and $R^{p,2}_\ell$, we get (2.2.8) with $M^p_\ell \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\nu,2s-a}_{p+1}(\omega_\ell)$ and $R^p_\ell \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\nu,2s}_{p+1}(\omega_\ell)$. This concludes the proof the lemma. ☐

We have to treat the second term in the right hand side of (2.2.7).

Lemma 2.2.3. *There are multilinear operators $\widetilde{M}^p_\ell \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\nu,2s-1}_{p+1}(\widetilde\omega_\ell)$, $\widetilde{R}^p_\ell \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\nu,2s}_{p+1}(\widetilde\omega_\ell)$, $\kappa \le p \le 2\kappa-1$, $0\le \ell \le p$ with $\widetilde\omega_\ell$ defined by $\widetilde\omega_\ell(j) = -1$, $j=0,\dots,\ell,p+1$, $\widetilde\omega_\ell(j)=1, j=\ell+1,\dots,p$, such that*

$$\begin{aligned} Re\ i\langle\Lambda_m^s C(u,\bar u)\bar u,\Lambda_m^s u\rangle = &\sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\ i\widetilde{M}^p_\ell(\underbrace{\bar u,\dots,\bar u}_{\ell},\underbrace{u,\dots,u}_{p-\ell},\bar u),u\rangle \\ &+\sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\ i\langle\widetilde{R}^p_\ell(\underbrace{\bar u,\dots,\bar u}_{\ell},\underbrace{u,\dots,u}_{p-\ell},\bar u),u\rangle.\end{aligned} \tag{2.2.40}$$

Proof of Lemma 2.2.3: Let $\widetilde{\omega}_\ell$ be defined in the statement of the lemma. We set

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{S}_p^\ell = \{(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{p+2};\ & \text{there exists bijection } \sigma \text{ from} \\ \{j; 0 \le j \le p+1, \widetilde{\omega}_\ell(j) = -1\} & \text{ to } \{j; 0 \le j \le p+1, \widetilde{\omega}_\ell(j) = 1\} \\ & \text{such that for each } j \text{ in the first set } n_j = n_{\sigma(j)}\}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.2.41}$$

Taking the expression of $C(u,\bar{u})$ defined above (2.2.4) into account, we compute using notation (2.2.2)

$$\begin{aligned} & Re\ i\langle \Lambda_m^{2s} C(u,\bar{u})\bar{u}, u\rangle \\ &= Re\ i\langle -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1} \Lambda_m^{2s} A_p\Big(\Lambda_m^{-1}(\frac{u+\bar{u}}{2})\Big)\Lambda_m^{-1}\bar{u}, u\rangle \\ &= Re\ i\langle \sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}^{p+2}}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} \pi_6 \Lambda_m^{2s}\Pi_{n_0}[(\Pi_{n_1}\Lambda_m^{-1}\bar{u})\dots(\Pi_{n_\ell}\Lambda_m^{-1}\bar{u}) \\ &\qquad\qquad \times (\Pi_{n_{\ell+1}}\Lambda_m^{-1}u)\dots(\Pi_{n_p}\Lambda_m^{-1}u)(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}\Lambda_m^{-1}\bar{u})], u\rangle \\ &= Re\ i\sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}^{p+2}}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} \pi_6 \int (\Pi_{n_0}\Lambda_m^{2s}\bar{u})(\Pi_{n_1}\Lambda_m^{-1}\bar{u})\dots(\Pi_{n_\ell}\Lambda_m^{-1}\bar{u}) \\ &\qquad\qquad \times (\Pi_{n_{\ell+1}}\Lambda_m^{-1}u)\dots(\Pi_{n_p}\Lambda_m^{-1}u)(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}\Lambda_m^{-1}\bar{u})dx,\end{aligned} \tag{2.2.42}$$

where π_6 is given by

$$\pi_6 = -\frac{1}{2^{p+1}}\binom{p}{\ell} B(n_1,\dots,n_{p+1}). \tag{2.2.43}$$

With the same reasoning as in the paragraph above (2.2.19) we may assume $n \notin \widetilde{S}_p^\ell$ in the computation of (2.2.42). Let $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}), \chi \equiv 1$ near zero, and suppχ small enough. According to (2.2.42), we define

$$\widetilde{M}_\ell^p(u_1,\dots,u_{p+1}) = \sum_{n\notin\widetilde{S}_p^\ell} \chi\Big(\frac{|\lambda_{n_0}^2 - \lambda_{n_{p+1}}^2|}{\lambda_{n_0}^2 + \lambda_{n_{p+1}}^2}\Big)\pi_6\Lambda_m^{2s}\Pi_{n_0}[(\Pi_{n_1}\Lambda_m^{-1}u_1),\dots,(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}\Lambda_m^{-1}u_{p+1})],$$

$$\widetilde{R}_\ell^p(u_1,\dots,u_{p+1}) = \sum_{n\notin\widetilde{S}_p^\ell} \Big(1-\chi\Big(\frac{|\lambda_{n_0}^2 - \lambda_{n_{p+1}}^2|}{\lambda_{n_0}^2 + \lambda_{n_{p+1}}^2}\Big)\Big)\pi_6\Lambda_m^{2s}\Pi_{n_0}[(\Pi_{n_1}\Lambda_m^{-1}u_1),\dots,(\Pi_{n_{p+1}}\Lambda_m^{-1}u_{p+1})].$$

It follows that (2.2.40) holds true.

Now we are left to check that $\widetilde{M}_\ell^p \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{p+1}^{\nu,2s-1}(\widetilde{\omega}_\ell)$ and $\widetilde{R}_\ell^p \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{p+1}^{\nu,2s}(\widetilde{\omega}_\ell)$.

Because of cut-off function and the support property of function B in the definition of $\widetilde{M}_\ell^p$ we know that (2.1.1) holds true for $\widetilde{M}_\ell^p$ and we may assume $n_0 \sim n_{p+1}$ when estimating L^2 norm of $\Pi_{n_0}\widetilde{M}_\ell^p(\Pi_{n_1}u_1,\dots,\Pi_{n_{p+1}}u_{p+1})$. Since there is a Λ_m^{-1} following each orthogonal projector $\Pi_{n_j},\quad j=1,\dots,p+1$, we see that (1.3.4) implies (2.1.2) with $\tau = 2s-1$ and some $\nu > 0$. Moreover, (2.1.15) with $\omega = \widetilde{\omega}_\ell$ is satisfied by the definition of $\widetilde{M}_\ell^p$. So $\widetilde{M}_\ell^p \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{p+1}^{\nu,2s-1}(\widetilde{\omega}_\ell)$.

Assume $\Pi_{n_0}[R(\Pi_{n_1}u_1,\dots,\Pi_{n_{p+1}}u_{p+1})]$ does not vanish. Then we have $|n_0 - n_{p+1}| \ge c(n_0+n_{p+1})$ for some small $c > 0$ because of the cut-off function and $n_{p+1} \ge \max\{n_1,\dots,n_p\} = n'$ because of the support property of function B. Therefore if $n_0 \geq n'$, we have

$$\mu(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) = (1+\sqrt{n'})(1+\min\{\sqrt{n_0},\sqrt{n_{p+1}}\}),$$
$$S(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) = |n_0 - n_{p+1}| + (1+\sqrt{n'})(1+\min\{\sqrt{n_0},\sqrt{n_{p+1}}\}),$$

and thus

$$\frac{\mu(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})}{S(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})} \leq C\frac{1+\sqrt{n'}}{\sqrt{n_0}+\sqrt{n_{p+1}}+1+\sqrt{n'}} \leq C\frac{\max_2(\sqrt{n_1},\dots,\sqrt{n_{p+1}})}{1+\sqrt{n_0}+\cdots+\sqrt{n_{p+1}}};$$

if $n_0 < n'$, we have

$$\mu(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) \leq (1+\sqrt{n'})^2, \qquad S(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) = |n'-n_{p+1}| + \mu(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}),$$

and thus

$$\frac{\mu(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})}{S(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})} \leq C\frac{1+\sqrt{n'}}{\sqrt{n'}+\sqrt{n_{p+1}}+1+\sqrt{n'}} \leq C\frac{\max_2(\sqrt{n_1},\dots,\sqrt{n_{p+1}})}{1+\sqrt{n_0}+\cdots+\sqrt{n_{p+1}}}.$$

Now using theorem 1.3.1 we see that (2.1.17) holds true with $\tau = 2s$ and some $\nu > 0$. But (2.1.24) with $\omega = \widetilde{\omega}_\ell$ is satisfied according to the definition. So $\widetilde{R}^p_\ell \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\nu,2s}_{p+1}(\widetilde{\omega}_\ell)$. This concludes the proof of lemma. □

Summarizing the above analysis gives an end to the proof of the proposition 2.2.1. □

In order to control the energy, let us first turn to some useful estimates in the following subsection.

2.3 Geometric bounds

This subsection is a modification of section 2.1 in [9]. We give it for the convenience of the reader. Consider the function on $\mathbb{R}^{p+2}$ depending on the parameter $m \in (0,+\infty)$, defined for $\ell = 0,\dots,p+1$ by

$$F^\ell_m(\xi_0,\dots,\xi_{p+1}) = \sum_{j=0}^{\ell}\sqrt{m^2+\xi_j^2} - \sum_{j=\ell+1}^{p+1}\sqrt{m^2+\xi_j^2}. \tag{2.3.1}$$

The main result of this subsection is the following theorem:

Theorem 2.3.1. *There is a zero measure subset $\mathcal{N}$ of $\mathbb{R}^*_+$ such that for any integers $0 \leq \ell \leq p+1$, any $m \in \mathbb{R}^*_+ - \mathcal{N}$, there are constants $c > 0, N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the lower bound*

$$|F^\ell_m(\lambda_{n_0},\dots,\lambda_{n_{p+1}})| \geq c(1+\sqrt{n_0}+\sqrt{n_{p+1}})^{-3-\rho}(1+|\sqrt{n_0}-\sqrt{n_{p+1}}|+\sqrt{n'})^{-2N_0} \tag{2.3.2}$$

holds true for any $\rho > 0$ and any $(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{p+2} - S^\ell_p$. Here λ_n are given by (1.1.1), $n' = \max\{n_1,\dots,n_p\}$, and S^ℓ_p is defined in (2.2.18), in which we have set $\omega_\ell(j) = -1,\ j = 0,\dots,\ell,\ \omega(j) = 1,\ j = \ell+1,\dots,p+1$.

The proof of the theorem will rely on some geometric estimates that we shall deduce from results of [10]. Let us show that under the condition of theorem 2.3.1 we have

(2.3.3)

$$|F_m^\ell(\lambda_{n_0},\dots,\lambda_{n_{p+1}})| \geq c(1+\sqrt{n_0}+\sqrt{n_{p+1}})^{-3-\rho}(1+|\sqrt{n_0}-\sqrt{n_{p+1}}|)^{-N_0}(1+\sqrt{n_1}+\cdots+\sqrt{n_p})^{-N_0}.$$

Let $I \subset (0,+\infty)$ be some compact interval and define for $0 \leq \ell \leq p+1$ functions

$$\begin{aligned} f_\ell &: [0,1]\times[0,1]^{p+2}\times I \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ &(z,x_0,\dots,x_{p+1},y) \to f_\ell(z,x_0,\dots,x_{p+1},y) \\ g_\ell &: [0,1]\times[0,1]^{p}\times I \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ &(z,x_1,\dots,x_p\ ,y) \to g_\ell(z,x_1,\dots,x_p\ ,y) \end{aligned} \tag{2.3.4}$$

by

$$\begin{aligned} f_\ell(z,x_0,\dots,x_{p+1},y) &= \sum_{j=0}^{\ell}\sqrt{z^2+y^2x_j^2} - \sum_{j=\ell+1}^{p+1}\sqrt{z^2+y^2x_j^2} \\ g_\ell(z,x_1,\dots,x_p,y) &= z\Big[\sum_{j=1}^{\ell}\frac{z}{\sqrt{z^2+y^2x_j^2}} - \sum_{j=\ell+1}^{p}\frac{z}{\sqrt{z^2+y^2x_j^2}}\Big] \qquad \text{when } z>0, \\ g_\ell(0,x_1,\dots,x_p,y) &\equiv 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3.5}$$

Then the graphs of f_ℓ, g_ℓ are subanalytic subsets of $[0,1]^{p+3}\times I$ and $[0,1]^{p+1}\times I$ respectively, so that f_ℓ, g_ℓ are continuous subanalytic functions (refer to Bierstone-Milman [5] for an introduction to subanalytic sets and functions). Let us consider the set Γ of points $(z,x)\in[0,1]^{p+3}$(resp. $(z,x)\in[0,1]^{p+1}$) such that $y\to f_\ell(z,x,y)$ (resp. $y \to g_\ell(z,x,y)$) vanishes identically. If $(z,x)\in\Gamma$ and $z\neq 0$, we have

$$\ell = \frac{p}{2} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sum_{j\leq\ell}x_j^{2\kappa} - \sum_{j\geq\ell+1}x_j^{2\kappa} = 0, \forall\kappa\in\mathbb{N}^*$$

where the sum is taken respectively for $0\leq j\leq p+1$ in the case of f_ℓ and $1\leq j\leq p$ for g_ℓ. This implies that there is a bijection $\sigma:\{0,\dots,\ell\}\to\{\ell+1,\dots,p+1\}$ (resp. $\{1,\dots,\ell\}\to\{\ell+1,\dots,p\}$) such that $x_{\sigma(j)}=x_j$ for any $j=0,\dots,\ell$ (resp. $j=1,\dots,\ell$)—see for instance the proof of lemma 5.6 in [10]. When p is even, denote by S_p the set of all bijections respectively from $\{0,\dots,\frac{p}{2}\}$ to $\{\frac{p}{2}+1,\dots,p+1\}$ and from $\{1,\dots,\frac{p}{2}\}$ to $\{\frac{p}{2},\dots,p\}$. Define for $0\leq\ell\leq p+1$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\ell(z,x) &\equiv z \qquad \text{if} \qquad \ell\neq\frac{p}{2}, \\ \rho_\ell(z,x) &= z\prod_{\sigma\in S_p}\Big[\sum_{j\leq p/2}(x_{\sigma(j)}^2-x_j^2)^2\Big] \qquad \text{if} \qquad \ell=\frac{p}{2}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.3.6}$$

where the sum in the above formula is taken for $j\geq 0$ (resp. $j\geq 1$) when we study f_ℓ (resp. g_ℓ). Then the set $\{\rho_\ell=0\}$ contains those points (z,x) such that $y\to f_\ell(z,x,y)$ (resp. $y\to g_\ell(z,x,y)$) vanishes identically. The following proposition is the same as proposition 2.1.2 in [9].

Proposition 2.3.2. *(i)There are $\widetilde{N}\in\mathbb{N}, \alpha_0>0, \delta>0, C>0$, such that for any $0\leq\ell\leq p+1$, any $\alpha\in(0,\alpha_0)$, any $(z,x)\in[0,1]^{p+3}$ (resp. $(z,x)\in[0,1]^{p+1}$) with $\rho_\ell(z,x)\neq 0$, any $N\geq\widetilde{N}$ the sets*

$$\begin{aligned} I_\ell^f(z,x,\alpha) &= \{y\in I; |f_\ell(z,x,y)|<\alpha\rho_\ell(z,x)^N\} \\ I_\ell^g(z,x,\alpha) &= \{y\in I; |g_\ell(z,x,y)|<\alpha\rho_\ell(z,x)^N\} \end{aligned} \tag{2.3.7}$$

have Lebesgue measure bounded from above by $C\alpha^\delta \rho_\ell(z,x)^{N\delta}$.

(ii) For any $N \geq \widetilde{N}$, *there is* $K \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that for any* $\alpha \in (0,\alpha_0)$, *any* $(z,x) \in [0,1]^{p+1}$, *the set* $I^g_\ell(z,x,\alpha)$ *may be written as the union of at most* K *open disjoint subintervals of* I.

We shall deduce (2.3.3) from several lemmas. Let us first introduce some notations. When p is odd or p is even and $\ell \neq \frac{p}{2}$, we set $\mathbb{N}'^p_\ell = \emptyset$. When p is even and $\ell = \frac{p}{2}$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{N}'^p_\ell = \{\tilde{n} = (n_1,\dots,n_p) \in \mathbb{N}^p; \text{ there is a bijection} \\ &\sigma : \{1,\dots,\ell\} \to \{\ell+1,\dots,p\} \text{ such that } n_{\sigma(j)} = n_j, j = 1,\dots,\ell\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3.8}$$

We set also

$$\mathbb{N}^{p+2}_\ell = \{(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{p+2};\ \tilde{n} \in \mathbb{N}'^p_\ell \text{ and } n_0 = n_{p+1}\}. \tag{2.3.9}$$

Of course, $\mathbb{N}^{p+2}_\ell = \emptyset$ if p is odd or p is even and $\ell \neq \frac{p}{2}$.

We remark first that it is enough to prove (2.3.3) for those $(n_1,\dots,n_p)$ which do not belong to $\mathbb{N}'^p_\ell$: actually if p is even, $\ell = \frac{p}{2}$ and $(n_1,\dots,n_p) \in \mathbb{N}'^p_\ell$, we have $|F^\ell_m(\lambda_{n_0},\dots,\lambda_{n_{p+1}})| = |\sqrt{m^2+\lambda^2_{n_0}} - \sqrt{m^2+\lambda^2_{n_{p+1}}}|$ which is bounded from below, when m stays in some compact interval, by

$$\frac{2|n_0 - n_{p+1}|}{\sqrt{m^2+\lambda^2_{n_0}} + \sqrt{m^2+\lambda^2_{n_{p+1}}}} \geq \frac{c}{1+\lambda_{n_0}+\lambda_{n_{p+1}}}$$

since from $(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{p+2} - S^\ell_p$, we have $n_0 \neq n_{p+1}$. Consequently (2.3.3) holds true trivially. From now on, we shall always consider $p-$tuple $\tilde{n}$ which do not belong to $\mathbb{N}'^p_\ell$.

Let us define for $\ell = 1,\dots,p$ another function on $\mathbb{R}^p$ given by

$$G^\ell_m(\xi_1,\dots,\xi_p) = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \sqrt{m^2+\xi_j^2} - \sum_{j=\ell+1}^{p} \sqrt{m^2+\xi_j^2}. \tag{2.3.10}$$

Let $J \subset (0,+\infty)$ be a given compact interval. For $\alpha > 0, N_0 \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \leq \ell \leq p+1$, $n = (n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{p+2}$ define

$$\begin{aligned} E^\ell_J(n,\alpha,N_0) = \{m \in J; |F^\ell_m(\lambda_{n_0},\dots,\lambda_{n_{p+1}})| < \alpha(1+\lambda_{n_0}+\lambda_{n_{p+1}})^{-3-\rho} \\ \times(1+|\lambda_{n_0}-\lambda_{n_{p+1}}|)^{-N_0}(1+\lambda_{n_1}+\cdots+\lambda_{n_p})^{-N_0}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3.11}$$

We set also for $\beta > 0, N_1 \in \mathbb{N}^*, \tilde{n} = (n_1,\dots,n_p) \in \mathbb{N}^p - \mathbb{N}'^p_\ell$

$$E'^\ell_J(\tilde{n},\beta,N_1) = \{m \in J; \left|\frac{\partial G^\ell_m}{\partial m}(\lambda_{n_1},\dots,\lambda_{n_p})\right| < \beta(1+\lambda_{n_1}+\cdots+\lambda_{n_p})^{-N_1}\}. \tag{2.3.12}$$

We define for $\gamma > \beta$ a subset of $\mathbb{N}^{p+2}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} S(\beta,\gamma,N_1) = \{(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{p+2} - \mathbb{N}^{p+2}_\ell : \lambda_{n_0} < \frac{\gamma}{3\beta}(1+\lambda_{n_1}+\cdots+\lambda_{n_p})^{N_1} \\ \text{or} \quad \lambda_{n_{p+1}} < \frac{\gamma}{3\beta}(1+\lambda_{n_1}+\cdots+\lambda_{n_p})^{N_1}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3.13}$$

Lemma 2.3.3. *Let $\widetilde{N}, \delta, \alpha_0$ be the constants defined in the statement of proposition 2.3.2. There are constants $C_1 > 0, M \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that for any $\beta \in (0, \alpha_0)$, any $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $N_1 > M\widetilde{N}$ and $N_1 > \frac{2pM}{\delta}$, one has*

$$meas\Big[\bigcup_{\tilde{n}\in\mathbb{N}^p-\mathbb{N}'^p_\ell} E'^\ell_J(\tilde{n}, \beta, N_1)\Big] \le C_1\beta^\delta. \tag{2.3.14}$$

Proof. Set $y = \frac{1}{m}$ and

$$z = (1 + \sum_{j=1}^p \lambda_{n_j})^{-1},\ x_j = \lambda_{n_j} z\ ,\ j = 1, \ldots, p.$$

Denote by X the set of points $(z, x) \in [0, 1]^{p+1}$ of the preceding form for $(n_1, \ldots, n_p)$ describing $\mathbb{N}^p$. When p is even and $\ell = p/2$, let X'^p_ℓ be the imagine of $\mathbb{N}'^p_\ell$ defined by (2.3.8) under the map $\tilde{n} \to (z, x)$. Using definition (2.3.6), we see that there are constants $M > 0, C > 0$, depending only on p, such that for $0 \le \ell \le p + 1$

$$\forall(z, x) \in X - X'^p_\ell\ ,\ z^M \le \rho_\ell(z, x) \le Cz \tag{2.3.15}$$

since , when $\ell = \frac{p}{2}$ and $(n_1, \ldots, n_p) \notin \mathbb{N}'^p_\ell$, $\sum_{j=1}^{\frac{p}{2}}(\lambda^2_{n_{\sigma(j)}} - \lambda^2_{n_j})^2 \ge 1$, by the definition of λ_{n_j}. Remark that with the above notations

$$\frac{\partial G^\ell_m}{\partial m}(\lambda_{n_1}, \ldots, \lambda_{n_p}) = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \frac{m}{\sqrt{m^2 + \lambda^2_{n_j}}} - \sum_{j=\ell+1}^{p} \frac{m}{\sqrt{m^2 + \lambda^2_{n_j}}} = \frac{1}{z} g_\ell(z, x_1, \ldots, x_p, y).$$

Then if $I = \{m^{-1}; m \in J\}$, we see that $m \in E'^\ell_J(\tilde{n}, \beta, N_1)$ for $n \notin \mathbb{N}'^p_\ell$ if and only if $y = \frac{1}{m}$ satisfies

$$|g_\ell(z, x_1, \ldots, x_p, y)| < \beta z^{N_1+1} \le \beta\rho_\ell(z, x)^{\frac{1}{M}(N_1+1)} \tag{2.3.16}$$

using (2.3.15). Applying proposition 2.3.2 (i), we see that for any fixed value of $(z, x) \in X - X'^p_\ell$, the measure of those y such that (2.3.16) holds true is bounded from above by

$$C\beta^\delta\rho_\ell(z, x)^{\frac{N_1+1}{M}\delta} \le C\beta^\delta z^{\frac{N_1+1}{M}\delta}$$

if we assume $N_1 \ge M\widetilde{N}$ and $\beta \in (0, \alpha_0)$. Consequently, we get with a constant C' depending only on J,

$$\begin{aligned} meas(E'^\ell_J(n', \beta, N_1)) &\le C'\beta^\delta(1 + \lambda_{n_1} + \cdots + \lambda_{n_p})^{-\frac{N_1+1}{M}\delta} \\ &\le C'\beta^\delta(1 + n_1 + \cdots + n_p)^{-\frac{N_1+1}{2M}\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Inequality (2.3.14) follows from this estimate and the assumption on N_1. ☐

Lemma 2.3.4. *Let $\widetilde{N}, \delta, \alpha_0$ be the constants defined in the statement of proposition 2.3.2. There are constants $M \in \mathbb{N}^*, \theta > 1, C_2 > 0$ such that for any $N_0, N_1 \in \mathbb{N}^*$ satisfying $N_0 > \widetilde{N}MN_1$ and $N_0\delta > 2(p + 2)MN_1$, any $0 < \beta < \gamma$ with $\frac{\gamma}{\beta} > \theta$, any $\alpha > 0$ satisfying $\alpha(\frac{\beta}{2\gamma})^{-\frac{N_0}{N_1}} < \alpha_0$, one has*

$$meas\Big[\bigcup_{n\in S(\beta,\gamma,N_1)} E^\ell_J(n, \alpha, N_0)\Big] \le C_2\alpha^\delta\Big(\frac{\beta}{2\gamma}\Big)^{-\frac{N_0}{N_1}\delta}. \tag{2.3.17}$$

Proof. We first remark that if $\lambda_{n_0} + \lambda_{n_{p+1}} > \frac{\gamma}{\beta}(1 + \lambda_{n_1} + \cdots + \lambda_{n_p})^{N_1}$ and $n \in S(\beta, \gamma, N_1)$, then either

$$\lambda_{n_0} \geq \frac{2\gamma}{3\beta}(1 + \lambda_{n_1} + \cdots + \lambda_{n_p})^{N_1} \qquad \text{or} \qquad \lambda_{n_{p+1}} \geq \frac{2\gamma}{3\beta}(1 + \lambda_{n_1} + \cdots + \lambda_{n_p})^{N_1},$$

which implies that

$$|F_m^\ell(\lambda_{n_0}, \ldots, \lambda_{n_{p+1}})| \geq c\frac{\gamma}{\beta}(1 + \lambda_{n_1} + \cdots + \lambda_{n_p})^{N_1}$$

for some constant $c > 0$ depending only on p and J, if $\frac{\gamma}{\beta} > \theta$ large enough. Consequently, if $\alpha < \alpha_0$ small enough relatively to c, we see that we have in this case $E_J^\ell(n, \alpha, N_0) = \emptyset$ when $n \in S(\beta, \gamma, N_1)$. We may therefore consider only indices n such that

$$n \in S(\beta, \gamma, N_1) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lambda_{n_0} + \lambda_{n_{p+1}} \leq \frac{\gamma}{\beta}(1 + \lambda_{n_1} + \cdots + \lambda_{n_p})^{N_1}.$$

Consequently, for $m \in E_J^\ell(n, \alpha, N_0)$ and $n \in S(\beta, \gamma, N_1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |F_m^\ell(\lambda_{n_0}, \ldots, \lambda_{n_{p+1}})| &\leq \alpha(1 + \lambda_{n_1} + \cdots + \lambda_{n_p})^{-N_0} \\ &\leq \alpha\left(\frac{\beta}{2\gamma}\right)^{-\frac{N_0}{N_1}}(1 + \lambda_{n_0} + \cdots + \lambda_{n_{p+1}})^{-\frac{N_0}{N_1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3.18}$$

Define for $n \in \mathbb{N}^{p+2}$

$$z = (1 + \sum_{j=0}^{p+1} \lambda_{n_j})^{-1}, \qquad x_j = \lambda_{n_j} z, \ j = 0, \ldots, p+1. \tag{2.3.19}$$

Denote by $X \subset [0,1]^{p+3}$ the set of points (z, x) of the preceding form, and let X_ℓ^p be the imagine of the set $\mathbb{N}_\ell^{p+2}$ defined by (2.3.9) under the map $n \to (z, x)$. By (2.3.6) we have again

$$\forall (z, x) \in X - X_\ell^p \ , \ z^M \leq \rho_\ell(z, x) \leq Cz$$

for some large enough M, depending only on p. Moreover

$$F_m^\ell(\lambda_{n_0}, \ldots, \lambda_{n_{p+1}}) = \frac{m}{z} f_\ell(z, x_0, \ldots, x_{p+1}, y)$$

and (2.3.18) implies that if $n \in S(\beta, \gamma, N_1)$ and $m \in E_J^\ell(n, \alpha, N_0)$, then y satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |f_\ell(z, x_0, \ldots, x_{p+1}, y)| &\leq C\alpha\left(\frac{\beta}{2\gamma}\right)^{-\frac{N_0}{N_1}} z^{1+\frac{N_0}{N_1}} \\ &\leq C\alpha\left(\frac{\beta}{2\gamma}\right)^{-\frac{N_0}{N_1}} \rho_\ell(z, x)^{\frac{1}{M}(1+\frac{N_0}{N_1})} \end{aligned} \tag{2.3.20}$$

We assume that α, N_0, N_1 satisfy the conditions of the statement of the lemma. Then by (i) of proposition 2.3.2 we get that the measure of those $y \in J$ satisfying (2.3.20) is bounded from above by

$$C\left[\alpha\left(\frac{\beta}{2\gamma}\right)^{-\frac{N_0}{N_1}}\right]^\delta z^{\frac{\delta}{M}(1+\frac{N_0}{N_1})}$$

for some constant C, independent of $N_0, N_1, \alpha, \beta, \gamma$. Consequently the measure of $E^\ell_J(n, \alpha, N_0)$ is bounded from above when $n \in S(\beta, \gamma, N_1)$ by

$$C\Big[\alpha\Big(\frac{\beta}{2\gamma}\Big)^{-\frac{N_0}{N_1}}\Big]^\delta\Big(1 + \lambda_{n_0} + \cdots + \lambda_{n_{p+1}}\Big)^{-\frac{\delta}{M}(1+\frac{N_0}{N_1})}$$
$$\le C'\Big[\alpha\Big(\frac{\beta}{2\gamma}\Big)^{-\frac{N_0}{N_1}}\Big]^\delta\Big(1 + n_0 + \cdots + n_{p+1}\Big)^{-\frac{\delta}{2M}(1+\frac{N_0}{N_1})}$$

for another constant C' depending on J. The conclusion of the lemma follows by summation, using that $\frac{\delta}{M}(1 + \frac{N_0}{N_1}) > 2(p + 2)$. □

Proof of theorem 2.3.1. : We fix N_0, N_1 satisfying the conditions stated in lemmas 2.3.3 and 2.3.4, and such that $N_0 > 2p + N_1$. We write when $n \notin S(\beta, \gamma, N_1),\ 0 \le \ell \le p + 1$,

$$E^\ell_J(n, \alpha, N_0) \subset [E^\ell_J(n, \alpha, N_0) \cap E'^\ell_J(\tilde n, \beta, N_1)] \cup [E^\ell_J(n, \alpha, N_0) \cap (E'^\ell_J(\tilde n, \beta, N_1)^c]$$

and estimate, using that we reduced ourselves to those $\tilde n \notin \mathbb{N}'^p_\ell$

(2.3.21)
$$meas\Big[\bigcup_{n;\ \tilde n\notin\mathbb{N}'^p_\ell} E^\ell_J(n, \alpha, N_0)\Big] \le meas\Big[\bigcup_{n\in S(\beta,\gamma,N_1)} E^\ell_J(n, \alpha, N_0)\Big] + meas\Big[\bigcup_{\tilde n\notin\mathbb{N}'^p_\ell} E'^\ell_J(\tilde n, \beta, N_1)\Big]$$
$$+ meas\Big[\bigcup_{n\in S(\beta,\gamma,N_0)^c-\mathbb{N}^{p+2}_\ell} E^\ell_J(n, \alpha, N_0) \cap E'^\ell_J(\tilde n, \beta, N_1)^c\Big].$$

Let us bound the measure of $E^\ell_J(n, \alpha, N_0) \cap E'^\ell_J(\tilde n, \beta, N_1)^c$ for $n \in S(\beta, \gamma, N_0)^c - \mathbb{N}^{p+2}_\ell$. If m belongs to that set, the inequality in (2.3.11) holds true. Remark that we may assume $\ell \le p$: if $\ell = p + 1$, $|F^\ell_m(\lambda_{n_0}, \dots, \lambda_{n_{p+1}})| \ge c(1 + \lambda_{n_0} + \lambda_{n_{p+1}})$ for some $c > 0$, which is not compatible with (2.3.11) for $\alpha < \alpha_0$ small enough. Let us write (2.3.11) as

$$\begin{aligned}|\lambda_{n_0} - \lambda_{n_{p+1}} + \widetilde G_m(\lambda_{n_0}, \dots, \lambda_{n_{p+1}})| &< \alpha(1 + \lambda_{n_0} + \lambda_{n_{p+1}})^{-3-\rho}\\ &\times(1 + |\lambda_{n_0} - \lambda_{n_{p+1}}|)^{-N_0}(1 + \lambda_{n_1} + \cdots + \lambda_{n_p})^{-N_0}\end{aligned} \tag{2.3.22}$$

with, using notation (2.3.10)

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde G_m(\lambda_{n_0}, \dots, \lambda_{n_{p+1}}) &= G_m(\lambda_{n_1}, \dots, \lambda_{n_p}) + R_m(\lambda_{n_0}, \lambda_{n_{p+1}})\\ R_m(\lambda_{n_0}, \lambda_{n_{p+1}}) &= (\sqrt{m^2 + \lambda^2_{n_0}} - \lambda_{n_0}) - (\sqrt{m^2 + \lambda^2_{n_{p+1}}} - \lambda_{n_{p+1}}).\end{aligned} \tag{2.3.23}$$

Since $n \in S(\beta, \gamma, N_1)^c$, we have by (2.3.13)

$$\lambda_{n_0} \ge \frac{\gamma}{3\beta}(1 + \lambda_{n_1} + \cdots + \lambda_{n_p})^{N_1}\ ,\ \lambda_{n_{p+1}} \ge \frac{\gamma}{3\beta}(1 + \lambda_{n_1} + \cdots + \lambda_{n_p})^{N_1}. \tag{2.3.24}$$

Consequently there is a constant $C > 0$, depending only on J, such that

$$|\frac{\partial R_m}{\partial m}(\lambda_{n_0}, \lambda_{n_{p+1}})| \le C\frac{\beta}{\gamma}(1 + \lambda_{n_1} + \cdots + \lambda_{n_p})^{-N_1}.$$

If γ is large enough and $m \in E'^{\ell}_J(\tilde{n}, \beta, N_1)^c$, we deduce from (2.3.12) that

$$|\frac{\partial \widetilde{G_m}}{\partial m}(\lambda_{n_0}, \dots, \lambda_{n_{p+1}})| \geq \frac{\beta}{2}(1 + \lambda_{n_1} + \dots + \lambda_{n_p})^{-N_1}. \tag{2.3.25}$$

By (ii) of proposition 2.3.2, we know that there is $K \in \mathbb{N}$, independent of α, β, γ such that the set $J - E'^{\ell}_J(\tilde{n}, \beta, N_1)$ is the union of at most K disjoint intervals $J_j(\tilde{n}, \beta, N_1)$, $1 \leq j \leq K$. Consequently, we have

$$E^{\ell}_J(n, \alpha, N_0) \cap (E'^{\ell}_J(\tilde{n}, \beta, N_1))^c \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{K} \{m \in J_j(\tilde{n}, \beta, N_1);\ (2.3.22) \text{ holds true}\}, \tag{2.3.26}$$

and on each interval $J_j(n', \beta, N_1)$, (2.3.25) holds true. We may on each such interval perform in the characteristic function of (2.3.22) the change of variable of integration given by $m \to \widetilde{G}_m(\lambda_{n_0}, \dots, \lambda_{n_{p+1}})$. Because of (2.3.25) this allows us to estimate the measure of (2.3.26) by

$$\begin{aligned} &K\frac{2}{\beta}\alpha(1 + \lambda_{n_0} + \lambda_{n_{p+1}})^{-3-\rho}(1 + |\lambda_{n_0} - \lambda_{n_{p+1}}|)^{-N_0}(1 + \lambda_{n_1} + \dots + \lambda_{n_p})^{-N_0+N_1} \\ \leq\ &CK\frac{2}{\beta}\alpha(1 + n_0 + n_{p+1})^{-\frac{1}{2}(3+\rho)}(1 + |\sqrt{n_0} - \sqrt{n_{p+1}}|)^{-N_0}(1 + n_1 + \dots + n_p)^{-\frac{1}{2}(N_0-N_1)} \end{aligned}$$

Summing in $n_0, \dots, n_{p+1}$, we see that since $N_0 > 2p + N_1$, the last term in (2.3.21) is bounded from above by $C_3\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ with C_3 independent of α, β, γ. By lemmas 2.3.3 and 2.3.4, we may thus bound (2.3.21) by

$$C_2\alpha^{\delta}\left(\frac{\beta}{2\gamma}\right)^{-\frac{N_0}{N_1}\delta} + C_1\beta^{\delta} + C_3\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$$

if α, β are small enough, γ is large enough and $\alpha(\frac{\beta}{\gamma})^{-\frac{N_0}{N_1}}$ is small enough. If we take $\beta = \alpha^{\sigma}$, $\gamma = \alpha^{-\sigma}$ with $\sigma > 0$ small enough, and $\alpha \ll 1$, we finally get for some $\delta' > 0$,

$$meas\left[\bigcup_{n;\ \tilde{n}\notin\mathbb{N}'^p_{\ell}} E^{\ell}_J(n, \alpha, N_0)\right] \leq C\alpha^{\delta'} \to 0 \text{ if } \alpha \to 0^+.$$

This implies that in this case the set of those $m \in J$ for which (2.3.3) does not hold true for any $c > 0$ is of zero measure. This concludes the proof. ☐

We will need a consequence of theorem 2.3.1:.

Proposition 2.3.5. *There is a zero measure subset $\mathcal{N}$ of $\mathbb{R}^*_+$ such that for any integers $0 \leq \ell \leq p + 1$, any $m \in \mathbb{R}^*_+ - \mathcal{N}$, there are constants $c > 0, N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the lower bound*

$$|F^{\ell}_m(\lambda_{n_0}, \dots, \lambda_{n_{p+1}})| \geq c(1 + \sqrt{n_0} + \sqrt{n_{p+1}})^{-3-\rho}(1 + \sqrt{n'})^{-2N_0}\frac{\mu(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1})^{2N_0}}{S(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1})^{2N_0}} \tag{2.3.27}$$

holds true for any $\rho > 0$ and any $(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{p+2} - S^{\ell}_p$ with $n_0 \sim n_{p+1}$ and $n_{p+1} \geq n'$. Here λ_n, n', S^{ℓ}_p are the same as those in theorem 2.3.1.

Proof. By theorem 2.3.1 we know (2.3.2) holds true under the conditions of the proposition. Since we assume $n_0 \sim n_{p+1}$ and $n_{p+1} \geq n'$, we have by (1.3.2) and (1.3.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1}) &\sim (1 + \sqrt{n_{p+1}})(1 + \sqrt{n'}), \\ S(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1}) &\sim |n_0 - n_{p+1}| + (1 + \sqrt{n_{p+1}})(1 + \sqrt{n'}) \\ &\sim (1 + \sqrt{n_{p+1}})(1 + |\sqrt{n_0} - \sqrt{n_{p+1}}| + \sqrt{n'}). \end{aligned} \tag{2.3.28}$$

Therefore we deduce from (2.3.2)

$$\begin{aligned} |F_m^\ell(\lambda_{n_0}, \dots, \lambda_{n_{p+1}})| &\geq c(1 + \sqrt{n_0} + \sqrt{n_{p+1}})^{-3-\rho} \frac{(1 + \sqrt{n_{p+1}})^{2N_0}}{S(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1})^{2N_0}} \\ &\geq c(1 + \sqrt{n_0} + \sqrt{n_{p+1}})^{-3-\rho}(1 + \sqrt{n'})^{-2N_0} \frac{\mu(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1})^{2N_0}}{S(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1})^{2N_0}}. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of the proposition. □

In the following subsection, we shall also use a simpler version of theorem 2.3.1. Let us introduce some notations. For $m \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, $\xi_j \in \mathbb{R}$, $j = 0, \dots, p+1$, $e = (e_0, \dots, e_{p+1}) \in \{-1, 1\}^{p+2}$, define

$$\widetilde{F}_m^{(e)}(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_{p+1}) = \sum_{j=0}^{p+1} e_j \sqrt{m^2 + \xi_j^2}. \tag{2.3.29}$$

When p is even and $\sharp\{j; e_j = 1\} = \frac{p}{2} + 1$, denote by $N^{(e)}$ the set of all $(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{p+2}$ such that there is a bijection σ from $\{j; 0 \leq j \leq p+1, e_j = 1\}$ to $\{j; 0 \leq j \leq p+1, e_j = -1\}$ so that for any j in the first set $n_j = n_{\sigma(j)}$. In the other cases, set $N^{(e)} = \emptyset$.

Proposition 2.3.6. *There is a zero measure subset $\mathcal{N}$ of $\mathbb{R}_+^*$ and for any $m \in \mathbb{R}_+^* - \mathcal{N}$, there are constants $c > 0, N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{p+2} - N^{(e)}$ one has*

$$|\widetilde{F}_m^{(e)}(\lambda_{n_0}, \dots, \lambda_{n_{p+1}})| \geq c(1 + \sqrt{n_0} + \dots + \sqrt{n_{p+1}})^{-N_0}. \tag{2.3.30}$$

Moreover, if $e_0 e_{p+1} = 1$, one has the inequality

$$|\widetilde{F}_m^{(e)}(\lambda_{n_0}, \dots, \lambda_{n_{p+1}})| \geq c(1 + \sqrt{n_0} + \sqrt{n_{p+1}})(1 + \sqrt{n_1} + \dots + \sqrt{n_p})^{-N_0}. \tag{2.3.31}$$

Proof. With the reasoning as in the proof of proposition 2.1.5 in [9], we get just by replacing $(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1})$ with $(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{p+1})$

$$|\widetilde{F}_m^{(e)}(\lambda_{n_0}, \dots, \lambda_{n_{p+1}})| \geq c(1 + \lambda_{n_0} + \dots + \lambda_{n_{p+1}})^{-N_0}$$

and

$$|\widetilde{F}_m^{(e)}(\lambda_{n_0}, \dots, \lambda_{n_{p+1}})| \geq c(1 + \lambda_{n_0} + \lambda_{n_{p+1}})(1 + \lambda_{n_1} + \dots + \lambda_{n_p})^{-N_0}$$

when $e_0 e_{p+1} = 1$. This concludes the proof of the proposition by noting (1.1.1). □

2.4 Energy control and proof of main theorem

We shall use the results of subsection 2.3 to control the energy. When $M(u_1,\dots,u_{p+1})$ is a $p+1$-linear form, let us define for $0 \leq \ell \leq p+1$,

$$L_\ell^-(M)(u_1,\dots,{}_{p+1}) = -\Lambda_m M(u_1,\dots,u_{p+1}) \\ -\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} M(u_1,\dots,\Lambda_m u_j,\dots,u_{p+1}) + \sum_{j=\ell+1}^{p+1} M(u_1,\dots,\Lambda_m u_j,\dots,u_{p+1}) \tag{2.4.1}$$

and

$$L_\ell^+(M)(u_1,\dots,{}_{p+1}) = -\Lambda_m M(u_1,\dots,u_{p+1}) - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} M(u_1,\dots,\Lambda_m u_j,\dots,u_{p+1}) \\ + \sum_{j=\ell+1}^{p} M(u_1,\dots,\Lambda_m u_j,\dots,u_{p+1}) - M(u_1,\dots,u_p,\Lambda_m u_{p+1}). \tag{2.4.2}$$

We shall need the following lemma:

Lemma 2.4.1. *Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the zero measure subset of $\mathbb{R}_+^*$ defined by taking the union of the zero measure subsets defined in proposition 2.3.5 and proposition 2.3.6, and fix $m \in \mathbb{R}_+^* - \mathcal{N}$. Let $\omega_\ell, \widetilde{\omega}_\ell$ be defined in the statement of proposition 2.2.1. There is a $\bar{\nu} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following statements hold true for any large enough integer s, any integer p with $\kappa \leq p \leq 2\kappa - 1$, any integer ℓ with $0 \leq \ell \leq p$, any $\rho > 0$:*

- *Let $\theta \in (0,1)$, $M_\ell^p \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{p+1}^{\nu,2s-a}(\omega_\ell)$ with $a = 2$ if $d \geq 2$ and $a = \frac{13}{6} - \varsigma$ for any $\varsigma \in (0,1)$ if $d = 1$ and $\widetilde{M}_\ell^p \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{p+1}^{\nu,2s-1}(\widetilde{\omega}_\ell)$. Define*

  $$M_\ell^{p,\epsilon}(u_1,\dots,u_{p+1}) = \sum_{n_0}\sum_{n_{p+1}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sqrt{n_0}+\sqrt{n_{p+1}}<\epsilon^{-\theta\kappa}\}} \Pi_{n_0} M_\ell^p(u_1,\dots,u_p,\Pi_{n_{p+1}}u_{p+1}). \tag{2.4.3}$$

  Then there are $\underline{M}_\ell^{p,\epsilon} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{p+1}^{\nu+\bar{\nu},2s-1}(\omega_\ell)$ and $\underline{M}_\ell^p \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{p+1}^{\nu,2s-2}(\widetilde{\omega}_\ell)$ satisfying

  $$\begin{aligned} L_\ell^-(\underline{M}_\ell^{p,\epsilon})(u_1,\dots,u_{p+1}) &= M_\ell^{p,\epsilon}(u_1,\dots,u_{p+1}), \\ L_\ell^+(\underline{M}_\ell^p)(u_1,\dots,u_{p+1}) &= \widetilde{M}_\ell^p(u_1,\dots,u_{p+1}) \end{aligned} \tag{2.4.4}$$

  with the estimate for all $N \geq \bar{\nu}$,

  $$\begin{aligned} \|\underline{M}_\ell^{p,\epsilon}\|_{\mathcal{M}_{p+1,N}^{\nu+\bar{\nu},2s-1}} &\leq C\epsilon^{-(4-a+\rho)\theta\kappa}\|M_\ell^p\|_{\mathcal{M}_{p+1,N}^{\nu,2s-a}}, \\ \|\underline{M}_\ell^p\|_{\mathcal{M}_{p+1,N}^{\nu+\bar{\nu},2s-2}} &\leq C\|\widetilde{M}_\ell^p\|_{\mathcal{M}_{p+1,N}^{\nu,2s-1}}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.4.5}$$

  where $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{M}_{p+1,N}^{\nu,\tau}}$ is defined in the statement of definition 2.1.1.

- *Let $R_\ell^p \in \widetilde{R}_{p+1}^{\nu,2s}(\omega_\ell), \widetilde{R}_\ell^p \in \widetilde{R}_{p+1}^{\nu,2s}(\widetilde{\omega}_\ell)$. Then there are $\underline{R}_\ell^p \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{p+1}^{\nu+\bar{\nu},2s}(\omega_\ell)$ and $\underline{R}_\ell'^p \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{p+1}^{\nu+\bar{\nu},2s}(\widetilde{\omega}_\ell)$ such that*

  $$\begin{aligned} L_\ell^-(\underline{R}_\ell^p)(u_1,\dots,u_{p+1}) &= R_\ell^p(u_1,\dots,u_{p+1}), \\ L_\ell^+(\underline{R}_\ell'^p)(u_1,\dots,u_{p+1}) &= \widetilde{R}_\ell^p(u_1,\dots,u_{p+1}). \end{aligned} \tag{2.4.6}$$

Proof. (i) We substitute in (2.4.4) $\Pi_{n_j}u_j$ to $u_j, j = 1,\dots,p+1$, and compose on the left with Π_{n_0}. According to (2.4.1), equalities in (2.4.4) may be written

$$-F^\ell_m(\lambda_{n_0},\dots,\lambda_{n_{p+1}})\Pi_{n_0}\underline{M}^{p,\epsilon}_\ell(\Pi_{n_1}u_1,\dots,\Pi_{n_{p+1}}u_{p+1}) = \Pi_{n_0}M^{p,\epsilon}_\ell(\Pi_{n_1}u_1,\dots,\Pi_{n_{p+1}}u_{p+1}), \tag{2.4.7}$$

$$\widetilde{F}^{(e)}_m(\lambda_{n_0},\dots,\lambda_{n_{p+1}})\Pi_{n_0}\underline{M}^{p}_\ell(\Pi_{n_1}u_1,\dots,\Pi_{n_{p+1}}u_{p+1}) = \Pi_{n_0}\widetilde{M}^{p}_\ell(\Pi_{n_1}u_1,\dots,\Pi_{n_{p+1}}u_{p+1}), \tag{2.4.8}$$

where F^ℓ_m is defined by (2.3.1) and $\widetilde{F}^{(e)}_m$ is defined by (2.3.29) with $e_0 = \cdots = e_\ell = e_{p+1} = -1, e_{\ell+1} = \cdots = e_p = 1$.

When considering (2.4.7), we may assume $\mathrm{n}_0 \sim n_{p+1}$, $n_{p+1} \geq n'$ and $(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) \notin S^\ell_p$ if the right hand side of (2.4.7) is non zero since we have (2.1.1) and (2.1.15) for $M^{p,\epsilon}_\ell$. Here S^ℓ_p is the same as that in proposition 2.3.5. Thus the assumptions concerning $(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})$ in proposition 2.3.5 hold true. We deduce from (2.3.27) and the condition $\sqrt{n_0} + \sqrt{n_{p+1}} < \epsilon^{-\theta\kappa}$ that

$$\begin{aligned}|F^\ell_m(\lambda_{n_0},\dots,\lambda_{n_{p+1}})|^{-1} &\leq C(1+\sqrt{n_0}+\sqrt{n_{p+1}})^{3+\rho}(1+\sqrt{n'})^{2N_0}\frac{S(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})^{2N_0}}{\mu(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})^{2N_0}}\\ &\leq C\epsilon^{-(4-a+\rho)\theta\kappa}(1+\sqrt{n_0}+\sqrt{n_{p+1}})^{a-1}(1+\sqrt{n'})^{2N_0}\frac{S(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})^{2N_0}}{\mu(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1})^{2N_0}}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.4.9}$$

for any $\rho > 0$. Therefore if we define

$$\underline{M}^{p,\epsilon}_\ell(u_1,\dots,u_{p+1}) = -\sum_{\substack{n\notin S^\ell_p\\ n_0\sim n_{p+1}, n_{p+1}\geq n'}} F^\ell_m(\lambda_{n_0},\dots,\lambda_{n_{p+1}})^{-1}\Pi_{n_0}M^{p,\epsilon}_\ell(\Pi_{n_1}u_1,\dots,\Pi_{n_{p+1}}u_{p+1}), \tag{2.4.10}$$

we obtain according to (2.4.9) and (2.1.2) that $\underline{M}^{p,\epsilon}_\ell \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\nu+\bar\nu,2s-1}_{p+1}(\omega_\ell)$ with the first estimate in (2.4.5) with $\bar\nu = 2N_0$.

When considering (2.4.8), we may assume $(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) \notin N^{(e)}$ defined after (2.3.29). Actually, because of (2.1.15), we cannot find a bijection σ from $\{0,\dots,\ell,p+1\}$ to $\{\ell+1,\dots,p\}$ such that $n_j = n_{\sigma(j)}$, $j = 0,\dots,\ell,p+1$ if the right hand side of (2.4.8) is non zero. Consequently, we may use lower bound (2.3.31). If we define $\underline{M}^p_\ell$ dividing in (2.4.8) by $\widetilde{F}^{(e)}_m$, we thus see that we get an element of $\underline{M}^p_\ell \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^{\nu+\bar\nu,2s-2}_{p+1}(\widetilde{\omega}_\ell)$ for some $\bar\nu$. This completes the proof of (2.4.4) and (2.4.5).

(ii) We deduce again from (2.4.6)

$$-F^\ell_m(\lambda_{n_0},\dots,\lambda_{n_{p+1}})\Pi_{n_0}\underline{R}^{p}_\ell(\Pi_{n_1}u_1,\dots,\Pi_{n_{p+1}}u_{p+1}) = \Pi_{n_0}R^{p}_\ell(\Pi_{n_1}u_1,\dots,\Pi_{n_{p+1}}u_{p+1}), \tag{2.4.11}$$

$$\widetilde{F}^{(e)}_m(\lambda_{n_0},\dots,\lambda_{n_{p+1}})\Pi_{n_0}\underline{R}'^{p}_\ell(\Pi_{n_1}u_1,\dots,\Pi_{n_{p+1}}u_{p+1}) = \Pi_{n_0}\widetilde{R}^{p}_\ell(\Pi_{n_1}u_1,\dots,\Pi_{n_{p+1}}u_{p+1}), \tag{2.4.12}$$

where F^ℓ_m and $\widetilde{F}^{(e)}_m$ are the same as in (2.4.7) and (2.4.8). Since $R^p_\ell \in \widetilde{R}^{\nu,2s}_{p+1}(\omega_\ell)$ and thus (2.1.24) implies the right hand side of (2.4.11) vanishes if $(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) \in S^\ell_p$, where S^ℓ_p is defined in (2.2.18), we may assume $(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) \notin S^\ell_p$. Consequently, the condition of theorem 2.3.1 is satisfied and we have by (2.3.2)

$$|F^\ell_m(\lambda_{n_0},\dots,\lambda_{n_{p+1}})|^{-1} \leq C(1+\sqrt{n_0}+\sqrt{n_1}+\cdots+\sqrt{n_{p+1}})^{2N_0+4}.$$

We then get an element of $\underline{R}^p_\ell \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\nu+\bar\nu,2s}_{p+1}(\omega_\ell)$ dividing in (2.4.11) by $-F^\ell_m$ with $\bar\nu = 2N_0+4$. Since $\widetilde{R}^p_\ell \in \widetilde{R}^{\nu,2s}_{p+1}(\widetilde{\omega}_\ell)$, we see that the right hand side of (2.4.12) vanishes if $(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) \in \widetilde{S}^\ell_p$, where $\widetilde{S}^\ell_p$ is defined in (2.2.41). This implies that we may assume $(n_0,\dots,n_{p+1}) \notin N^{(e)}$ which is defined after

(2.3.29) with $e_0 = \cdots = e_\ell = e_{p+1} = -1$, $e_{\ell+1} = \cdots = e_p = 1$. Thus the condition of proposition 2.3.6 is satisfied and we have

$$|\widetilde{F}_m^{(e)}(\lambda_{n_0}, \dots, \lambda_{n_{p+1}})|^{-1} \leq C(1 + \sqrt{n_0} + \cdots + \sqrt{n_{p+1}})^{N_0}.$$

This allows us to get an element $\underline{R}_\ell'^p \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{p+1}^{\nu+\bar{\nu},2s}(\widetilde{\omega}_\ell)$ for some $\bar{\nu}$ by dividing by $\widetilde{F}_m^{(e)}$ in (2.4.12). This concludes the proof. $\square$

Proposition 2.4.2. *Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the zero measure subset of $\mathbb{R}_+^*$ defined in lemma 2.4.1, and fix $m \in \mathbb{R}_+^* - \mathcal{N}$. Let $\rho > 0$ be any positive number and Θ_s defined in (2.2.5). There are for any large enough integer s , a map Θ_s^1, sending $\mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d) \times (0, \frac{1}{2})$ to $\mathbb{R}$, and maps Θ_s^2, Θ_s^3, Θ_s^4 sending $\mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to $\mathbb{R}$ such that there is a constant $C_s > 0$ and for any $u \in \mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $||u||_{\mathscr{H}^s} \leq 1$ and any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, one has*

$$\begin{aligned} &|\Theta_s^1(u, \epsilon)| \leq C_s \epsilon^{-(4-a+\rho)\theta\kappa} ||u||_{\mathscr{H}^s}^{\kappa+2}, \qquad (a = 2 \textit{ if } d \geq 2 \textit{ and} \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad a = \frac{13}{6} - \varsigma \textit{ for any } \varsigma \in (0,1) \textit{ if } d = 1), \\ &|\Theta_s^2(u)|, |\Theta_s^3(u)|, |\Theta_s^4(u)| \leq C_s ||u||_{\mathscr{H}^s}^{\kappa+2} \end{aligned} \tag{2.4.13}$$

and such that

$$R(u) \overset{def}{=} \frac{d}{dt}\Big[\Theta_s(u(t,\cdot)) - \Theta_s^1(u(t,\cdot),\epsilon) - \Theta_s^2(u(t,\cdot)) - \Theta_s^3(u(t,\cdot)) - \Theta_s^4(u(t,\cdot))\Big] \tag{2.4.14}$$

satisfies

$$|R(u)| \leq C_s \epsilon^{-(4-a+\rho)\theta\kappa} ||u||_{\mathscr{H}^s}^{2\kappa+2} + C_s \epsilon^{(a-1)\theta\kappa} ||u||_{\mathscr{H}^s}^{\kappa+2} + C_s ||u||_{\mathscr{H}^s}^{2\kappa+2}. \tag{2.4.15}$$

Proof. Considering the right hand side of (2.2.6), we decompose

$$M_\ell^p(u_1, \dots, u_{p+1}) = M_\ell^{p,\epsilon}(u_1, \dots, u_{p+1}) + V_\ell^{p,\epsilon}(u_1, \dots, u_{p+1}), \tag{2.4.16}$$

where the first term is given by (2.4.3) and the second one by

$$V_\ell^{p,\epsilon}(u_1, \dots, u_{p+1}) = \sum_{n_0} \sum_{n_{p+1}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sqrt{n_0}+\sqrt{n_{p+1}} \geq \epsilon^{-\theta\kappa}\}} \Pi_{n_0} M_\ell^p(u_1, \dots, u_p, \Pi_{n_{p+1}} u_{p+1}). \tag{2.4.17}$$

By definition 2.1.1, we get for $a = 2$ if $d \geq 2$ and $a = \frac{13}{6} - \varsigma$ if $d = 1$

$$\begin{aligned} ||V_\ell^{p,\epsilon}(u_1, \dots, u_{p+1})||_{\mathscr{H}^{-s}} &\leq C_N \sum_{n_0} \cdots \sum_{p+1} (1 + \sqrt{n_0} + \sqrt{n_{p+1}})^{2s-a} \frac{(1+\sqrt{n'})^\nu \mu(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1})^N}{S(n_0, \dots, n_{p+1})^N} \\ &\quad \times \mathbf{1}_{\{\sqrt{n_0}+\sqrt{n_{p+1}} \geq \epsilon^{-\theta\kappa}, |n_0 - n_{p+1}| < \frac{1}{2}(n_0+n_{p+1}), n' \leq n_{p+1}\}} (1 + \sqrt{n_0})^{-s} \prod_{j=1}^{p+1} ||\Pi_{n_j} u_j||_{L^2} \end{aligned} \tag{2.4.18}$$

Following the proof of proposition 2.1.2, we know that the gain of a powers of $\sqrt{n_0} + \sqrt{n_{p+1}}$ in the first term in the right hand side, coming from the fact that $M_\ell^p \in \mathcal{M}_{p+1}^{\nu,2s-a}$, together with the condition $\sqrt{n_0} + \sqrt{n_{p+1}} \geq \epsilon^{-\theta\kappa}$, allows us to estimate , for N large enough and s_0 large enough with respect to ν, (2.4.18) by $C\epsilon^{(a-1)\theta\kappa} \Pi_{j=1}^p ||u_j||_{\mathscr{H}^{s_0}} ||u_{p+1}||_{\mathscr{H}^s}$. Consequently, the quantity

$$\sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1} \sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\ i \langle V_\ell^{p,\epsilon}(\bar{u}, \dots, \bar{u}, u, \dots, u), u \rangle \tag{2.4.19}$$

is bounded form above by the second term of the right hand side of (2.4.15). In the rest of the proof, we may therefore replace in the right hand side of (2.2.6) M_ℓ^p by $M_\ell^{p,\epsilon}$.

Apply lemma 2.4.1 to $M_\ell^{p,\epsilon}$, $\widetilde{M}_\ell^p$, R_ℓ^p, $\widetilde{R}_\ell^p$. This gives $\underline{M}_\ell^{p,\epsilon}, \underline{M}_\ell^p, \underline{R}_\ell^p, \underline{R}_\ell'^p$. We set

$$\begin{aligned}
\Theta_s^1(u(t,\cdot),\epsilon) &= \sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\langle \underline{M}_\ell^{p,\epsilon}(\bar u,\dots,\bar u,u,\dots,u),u\rangle,\\
\Theta_s^2(u(t,\cdot)) &= \sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\langle \underline{M}_\ell^{p}(\bar u,\dots,\bar u,u,\dots,u,\bar u),u\rangle,\\
\Theta_s^3(u(t,\cdot)) &= \sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\langle \underline{R}_\ell^{p}(\bar u,\dots,\bar u,u,\dots,u),u\rangle,\\
\Theta_s^4(u(t,\cdot)) &= \sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\langle \underline{R}_\ell'^{p}(\bar u,\dots,\bar u,u,\dots,u,\bar u),u\rangle.
\end{aligned}\tag{2.4.20}$$

The general term in $\Theta_s^1(u(t,\cdot),\epsilon)$ has modulus bounded from above by

$$||\underline{M}_\ell^{p,\epsilon}(\bar u,\dots,\bar u,u,\dots,u)||_{\mathscr{H}^{-s}}||u||_{\mathscr{H}^s} \le C\epsilon^{-(4-a+\rho)\theta\kappa}||u||_{\mathscr{H}^s}^{\kappa}||u||_{\mathscr{H}^s}^2$$

for u in the unit ball of $\mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$, using proposition 2.1.2 with $\tau = 2s-1$ and proposition 1.1.19 and (2.4.5). This gives the first inequality of (2.4.13). To obtain the other estimates in (2.4.13), we apply proposition 2.1.2 to $\underline{M}_\ell^p$, remarking that if in (2.1.3) $\tau = 2s-1$ and s is large enough, the left hand side of (2.1.3) controls the $\mathscr{H}^{-s}$ norm of $\underline{M}_\ell^p(\bar u,\dots,\bar u,u,\dots,u,\bar u)$. We also apply proposition 2.1.5 with $\tau = 2s$ in (2.1.18) to $\underline{R}_\ell^p$, $\underline{R}_\ell'^p$. Then if s_0 is large enough, the left hand side of (2.1.18) controls $\mathscr{H}^{-s}$ norm of $\underline{R}_\ell^p(\bar u,\dots,\bar u,u,\dots,u)$ and $\underline{R}_\ell'^p(\bar u,\dots,\bar u,u,\dots,u,\bar u)$. These give us the other inequalities in (2.4.13). Consequently we are left with proving (2.4.15). Remarking that we may also write the equation as

$$(D_t-\Lambda_m)u = -F\bigg(\Lambda_m^{-1}(\frac{u+\bar u}{2})\bigg),\tag{2.4.21}$$

we compute using notation (2.4.1)

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\Theta_s^1(u,\epsilon) &= \sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\ i\langle L_\ell^-(\underline{M}_\ell^{p,\epsilon})(\bar u,\dots,\bar u,u,\dots,u),u\rangle\\
&+\sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p}\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} Re\ i\langle \underline{M}_\ell^{p,\epsilon}(\bar u,\dots,\bar F,\dots,\bar u,u,\dots,u),u\rangle\\
&-\sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p}\sum_{j=\ell+1}^{p+1} Re\ i\langle \underline{M}_\ell^{p,\epsilon}(\bar u,\dots,\bar u,u,\dots,F,\dots,u),u\rangle\\
&+\sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\ i\langle \underline{M}_\ell^{p,\epsilon}(\bar u,\dots,\bar u,u,\dots,u),F\rangle.
\end{aligned}\tag{2.4.22}$$

By assumption on F, we have by proposition 1.1.19 and 1.1.21 that $||F(v)||_{\mathscr{H}^s} \le C||u||_{\mathscr{H}^s}^{\kappa}||u||_{\mathscr{H}^s}$ if s is large enough and $||u||_{\mathscr{H}^s} \le 1$. Since $\underline{M}_\ell^{p,\epsilon} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{p+1}^{\nu+\bar\nu,2s-1}(\omega_\ell)$, we may apply proposition 2.1.2 with $\tau = 2s-1$ and (2.4.5) to see that the last three terms in (2.4.22) have modulus bounded from above by the first term in the right hand side of (2.4.15). When computing $\frac{d}{dt}\Theta_s(u)$, noting that we have replaced M_ℓ^p by $M_\ell^{p,\epsilon}$, the first term in the right hand side of (2.2.6) is the first term in the right hand side of (2.4.22) because of (2.4.4). Consequently, these contributions will cancel out each other in the expression $\frac{d}{dt}[\Theta_s(u) - \Theta_s^1(u,\epsilon)]$. We compute

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\Theta_s^2(u) = &\sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\ i\langle L_\ell^+(\underline{M}_\ell^p)(\bar{u},\dots,\bar{u},u,\dots,u,\bar{u}),u\rangle \\ &+\sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p}\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} Re\ i\langle \underline{M}_\ell^p(\bar{u},\dots,\bar{F},\dots,\bar{u},u,\dots,u,\bar{u}),u\rangle \\ &-\sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p}\sum_{j=\ell+1}^{p} Re\ i\langle \underline{M}_\ell^p(\bar{u},\dots,\bar{u},u,\dots,F,\dots,u,\bar{u}),u\rangle \\ &+\sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\ i\langle \underline{M}_\ell^p(\bar{u},,\dots,\bar{u},u,\dots,u,\bar{F}),u\rangle \\ &+\sum_{p=\kappa}^{2\kappa-1}\sum_{\ell=0}^{p} Re\ i\langle \underline{M}_\ell^p(\bar{u},,\dots,\bar{u},u,\dots,u,\bar{u}),F\rangle.\end{aligned} \tag{2.4.23}$$

Since $\underline{M}_\ell^p \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{p+1}^{\nu+\bar{\nu},2s-2}(\widetilde{\omega}_\ell)$, we have by proposition 2.1.2 with $\tau = 2s-1$, proposition 1.1.19 and (2.4.5) that the last three terms are estimated by the last term in the right hand side of (2.4.15) if s is large enough. The first one, according to lemma 2.4.1, cancels the contribution of $\widetilde{M}_\ell^p$ in (2.2.6) when computing $R(u)$. We may treat $\Theta_s^3(u)$ and $\Theta_s^4(u)$ in the same way using proposition 2.1.5 with $\tau = 2s$, and this will lead to the third term in the right hand side of (2.4.15). Finally, the last term in (2.2.6) contributes to the last term in the right hand side of (2.4.15). This concludes the proof of the proposition. ☐

Proof of theorem 2.1.1. : We deduce from (2.4.13) and (2.4.15)

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_s(u(t,\cdot)) \le\ &\Theta_s(u(0,\cdot)) - \Theta_s^1(u(0,\cdot),\epsilon) - \Theta_s^2(u(0,\cdot)) - \Theta_s^3(u(0,\cdot)) - \Theta_s^4(u(0,\cdot)) \\ &+\Theta_s^1(u(t,\cdot),\epsilon) + \Theta_s^2(u(t,\cdot)) + \Theta_s^3(u(t,\cdot)) + \Theta_s^4(u(t,\cdot)) \\ &+C_s\epsilon^{-(4-a+\rho)\theta\kappa}\int_0^t ||u(t',\cdot)||_{\mathscr{H}^s}^{2\kappa}||u(t',\cdot)||_{\mathscr{H}^s}^2 dt' \\ &+C_s\epsilon^{(a-1)\theta\kappa}\int_0^t ||u(t',\cdot)||_{\mathscr{H}^s}^{\kappa}||u(t',\cdot)||_{\mathscr{H}^s}^2 dt' \\ &+C_s\int_0^t ||u(t',\cdot)||_{\mathscr{H}^s}^{2\kappa}||u(t',\cdot)||_{\mathscr{H}^s}^2 dt',\end{aligned} \tag{2.4.24}$$

where $a = 2$ if $d \ge 2$ and $a = \frac{13}{6} - \varsigma$ for any $\varsigma \in (0,1)$ if $d = 1$. Take $\theta = \frac{1}{3+\rho}$ and $B > 1$ a constant such that for any (v_0, v_1) in the unit ball of $\mathscr{H}^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathscr{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $u(0,\cdot) = \epsilon(-iv_1 + \Lambda_m v_0)$ satisfies $||u(0,\cdot)||_{\mathscr{H}^s} \le B\epsilon$. Let $K > B$ be another constant to be chosen, and assume that for τ' in some interval $[0,T]$ we have $||u(\tau',\cdot)||_{\mathscr{H}^s} \le K\epsilon \le 1$. If $d \ge 2$, using (2.4.13) with $a = 2$ we deduce from (2.4.24) and that there is a constant $C > 0$, independent of B, K, ϵ, such that as long as $t \in [0,T]$

$$||u(t,\cdot)||_{\mathscr{H}^s}^2 \le C[B^2 + \epsilon^{\frac{1}{3+\rho}\kappa}K^{\kappa+2} + t\epsilon^{\frac{4+\rho}{3+\rho}\kappa}(K^{2\kappa+2} + K^{\kappa+2}) + t\epsilon^{2\kappa}K^{2\kappa+2}]\epsilon^2.$$

If we assume that $T \le c\epsilon^{-\frac{4+\rho}{3+\rho}}$, where $\rho > 0$ is arbitrary, for a small enough $c > 0$, and that ϵ is small enough, we get $||u(t,\cdot)||^2_{\mathscr{H}^s} \le C(2B^2)\epsilon^2$. If K has been chosen initially so that $2CB^2 < K^2$, we get by a standard continuity argument that the priori bound $||u(t,\cdot)||_{\mathscr{H}^s} \le K\epsilon$ holds true on $[0, c\epsilon^{-\frac{4+\rho}{3+\rho}}]$, in other words, the solution extends to such an interval $|t| \le c\epsilon^{-\frac{4}{3}(1-\rho)\kappa}$ with another arbitrary $\rho > 0$. If $d = 1$, we may use (2.4.13) with $a = \frac{13}{6} - \varsigma$ to get

$$||u(t,\cdot)||^2_{\mathscr{H}^s} \le C[B^2 + \epsilon^{\frac{7-6\varsigma}{18+6\rho}\kappa}K^{\kappa+2} + t\epsilon^{\frac{25+6(\rho-\varsigma)}{18+6\rho}\kappa}(K^{2\kappa+2} + K^{\kappa+2}) + t\epsilon^{2\kappa}K^{2\kappa+2}]\epsilon^2.$$

With the same reasoning we may get in this case that the solution extends to an interval of $|t| < c\epsilon^{-\frac{25}{18}(1-\rho)\kappa}$ for some small $c > 0$ and any $\rho > 0$. This concludes the proof of the theorem. ☐

Acknowledgements. The author thanks his advisors Daoyuan Fang and Jean-Marc Delort for their guidance. Most of this work has been done during the stay of the author at Université Paris-Nord, during the academic year 2007-2008.

References

[1] D. Bambusi: *Birkhoff normal form for some nonlinear PDEs*, Comm. Math. Phys. 234 (2003), no. 2, 253–285.

[2] D. Bambusi, J.-M. Delort, B. Grébert and J. Szeftel: *Almost global existence for Hamiltonian semi-linear Klein-Gordon equations with small Cauchy data on Zoll manifolds*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 60 (2007), no. 11, 1665–1690.

[3] D. Bambusi and B. Grébert: *Birkhoff normal form for partial differential equations with tame modulus*, Duke Math. J. 135 (2006), no. 3, 507–567.

[4] M. Berti and P. Bolle: *Periodic solutions for higher dimensional nonlinear wave equations*, preprint (2007).

[5] E. Bierstone and P. Milman: *Semianalytic and subanalytic sets*, Inst. Hautes, Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1998), no. 67, 5-42.

[6] J. Bourgain: *Construction of approximative and almost periodic solutions of perturbed linear Schrödinger and wave equations*, Geom. Funct. Anal. 6 (1996), no. 2, 201–230.

[7] J. Bourgain: *Green's function estimates for lattice Schrödinger operators and applications.* Annals of Mathematics Studies, 158. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, (2005), x+173 pp.

[8] W. Craig: *Problèmes de petits diviseurs dans les équations aux dérivées partielles.* Panoramas et Synthèses, 9. Société Mathématique de France, Paris, (2000), viii+120 pp.

[9] J.-M. Delort: *On long time existence for small solutions of semi-linear Klein-Gordon equations on the torus*, to appear, Journal Analyse Mathématique.

[10] J.-M. Delort and J. Szeftel: *Long-time existence for small data nonlinear Klein-Gordon equations on tori and spheres*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices (2004), no. 37, 1897-1966.

[11] J.-M. Delort and J. Szeftel: *Long-time existence for semi-linear Klein-Gordon equations with small Cauchy data on Zoll manifolds*, Amer. J. Math. 128 (2006), no. 5, 1187-1218.

[12] H. Eliasson and S. Kuksin: *KAM For the non-linear Schrödinger equation*, to appear, Annals of Mathematics.

[13] B. Grébert: *Birkhoff normal form and hamiltonian PDEs*, Partial differential equations and applications, 1–46, Sémin. Congr., 15, Soc. Math. France, Paris, 2007.

[14] B. Grébert, R. Imekraz and É. Paturel: *On the long time behavior for solutions of semi-linear harmonic oscillator with small Cauchy data on* R^d, preprint, (2008).

[15] R. Hardt: *Stratification of real analytic mappings and images*, Invent. Math. 28 (1975), 193-208.

[16] B. Helffer: *Théorie spectrale pour des opérateurs globalment elliptiques*, Astérisque, 112 (1984).

[17] L. Hörmander: *Lectures on Nonlinear Hyperbolic Differential Equations*, Mathématiques & Applications, Vol 26, Springer.

[18] S. Klainerman: *Global existence of small amplitude solutions to nonlinear Klein-Gordon equations in four space–time dimensions*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 38, (1985) 631–641.

[19] H. Koch and D. Tataru: L^p *eigenfunction bounds for the Hermite operator*, Duke Math. J. 128 (2005), no. 2, 369-392.

[20] S. Kuksin: *Nearly integrable infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1556. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993. xxviii+101 pp.

[21] S. Kuksin: *Analysis of Hamiltonian PDEs*. Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, 19. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000. xii+212 pp.

[22] T. Ozawa, K. Tsutaya and Y. Tsutsumi: *Global existence and asymptotic behavior of solutions for the Klein-Gordon equations with quadratic nonlinearity in two space dimensions*. Math. Z. 222 (1996), no. 3, 341–362.

[23] J. Shatah: *Normal forms and quadratic nonlinear Klein-Gordon equations*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 38 (1985), no. 5, 685–696.